arXiv:1604.06622v1 [math.PR] 22 Apr 2016

The Hyperbolic Brownian Plane

Thomas Budzinski *

Abstract

We introduce and study a new random surface which we call the *hyperbolic Brownian plane* and which is the near-critical scaling limit of the hyperbolic triangulations constructed in [16]. The law of the hyperbolic Brownian plane is obtained after biasing the law of the Brownian plane [19] by an explicit martingale depending on its perimeter and volume processes studied in [17]. Although the hyperbolic Brownian plane has the same local properties as those of the Brownian plane, its large scale structure is much different since we prove e.g. that is has exponential volume growth.

Introduction

The construction and the study of random surfaces as scaling limits of random planar maps has been a very active field of research in the last years, see [26, 29] for survey. The first such random surface that was built is the Brownian map [27, 30], which is now known to be the scaling limit of a wide class of finite planar maps conditioned to be large [1, 3, 10, 13, 20]. Curien & Le Gall introduced the Brownian plane in [19], which can be seen as a non-compact version of the Brownian map. They showed that it is the scaling limit of the Uniform Infinite Planar Quadrangulation (UIPQ) and conjectured it to be the scaling limit of several other random infinite lattices such as the Uniform Infinite Planar Triangulation of Angel & Schramm [9] (a fact that we verify below for type-I triangulations). The goal of this paper is to introduce and to study a new random surface which we call *the hyperbolic Brownian plane* that is obtained as a near-critical scaling limit of the hyperbolic triangulations of [16].

The Brownian plane as the near-critical limit of the PSHT. The spatial Markov property of random maps is a key feature of these random lattices and has been used a lot in recent years to study their geometric structure, see e.g. [7, 14, 18]. Recently, Angel & Ray characterized all the triangulations of the half-plane enjoying a spatial Markov property and discovered a new family of triangulations of the half-plane having hyperbolic flavor [8]. This has been extended to cover the case of the full-plane in [16]. More precisely, [16] constructs a one-parameter family of Markovian random triangulations of the plane $(\mathbf{T}_\kappa)_{0<\kappa\leq\kappa_c}$ where the value κ_c is equal to $\frac{2}{27}$. At the critical value $\kappa = \kappa_c$, the random triangulation $\mathbf{T}_{\kappa_c}$ is the UIPT of Angel & Schramm whereas $\mathbf{T}_\kappa$ has hyperbolic features when $\kappa < \kappa_c$. Note that if $\kappa < \kappa_c$ is fixed then it is impossible to rescale $\mathbf{T}_\kappa$ to get a scaling limit in the Gromov–Hausdorff sense[1]. Hence, in order

*ENS Paris and Université Paris-Saclay, thomas.budzinski@ens.fr

[1] we can find in the ball of radius r of $\mathbf{T}_\kappa$ a number of points at distance at least $\frac{r}{10}$ from each other that goes to $+\infty$ as $r \to +\infty$ so the sequence $\left(\frac{1}{r}B_r(\mathbf{T}_\kappa)\right)_{r\geq 1}$ is not tight for the Gromov–Hausdorff topology

to get a proper scaling limit, it is necessary to let the parameter $\kappa \to \kappa_c$ at the right speed as we renormalize the distances. If we let $\kappa \to \kappa_c$ too slow, then there is no scaling limit as above and if $\kappa \to \kappa_c$ too fast, then the scaling limit is just the Brownian plane: our approach is *near-critical*.

Our main tool for proving such a convergence will be to use the absolute continuity relations between the hyperbolic triangulations and the UIPT in order to deduce convergence results for hyperbolic maps from the analog results for the UIPT. The above works [9, 16] deal with type-II triangulations where loops are forbidden. Unfortunately, as of today, no scaling limit result is available in the literature for type-II triangulations. This forces us to work with type-I triangulations where loops are allowed and for which the convergence to the Brownian map has been established [27]. Our first (easy) task is then to generalize the results of [16] and to introduce the type-I PSHT that we write

$$\left(\mathbb{T}_\lambda\right)_{0<\lambda\leq\lambda_c} \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda_c = \frac{1}{12\sqrt{3}}.$$

As above in the critical case $\lambda = \lambda_c$ the random lattice $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_c}$ is just the type-I UIPT [20, 33]. We denote by $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ the Brownian plane of [19]. For $r \geq 0$ we write $\overline{B}_r(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$ for the hull of radius r, that is, the union of the closed ball of radius r centered at the origin point of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ together with all the bounded connected components of its complementary. We also write $(|\partial\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|)_{r\geq 0}$ and $(|\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|)_{r\geq 0}$ for the perimeter and volume processes of the Brownian plane that are defined in [17]. They correspond roughly to the perimeters and the volumes of the hulls of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$. Our main theorem is the following:

Theorem 1 ($\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ as a near-critical scaling limit of the PSHT)**.** For $n \geq 0$, consider $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$ the type-I planar stochastic hyperbolic triangulation of parameter $\lambda_n \to \lambda_c$ in such a way that

$$\lambda_n = \lambda_c\left(1 - \frac{2}{3n^4}\right) + o\left(\frac{1}{n^4}\right), \tag{1}$$

then we have the following convergence for the local Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov distance:

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{(d)} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ is a random locally compact metric space that we call the *hyperbolic Brownian plane*. Its distribution is characterized by the fact that for every $r \geq 0$, the random measured metric space $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)$ has density

$$e^{-2|\overline{B_{2r}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|}e^{|\partial\overline{B_{2r}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|}\int_0^1 e^{-3|\partial\overline{B_{2r}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|x^2}\mathrm{d}x \tag{2}$$

with respect to $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$.

The choice of the constant $\frac{2}{3}$ in (1) was made so that the expression (2) looks as simple as possible. Of course another choice woud have resulted in a scaling limit just obtained by dilating the hyperbolic Brownian plane. The fact that we need to bias $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$ by a function of the perimeter and volume of the hull of radius $2r$ instead of r may seem surprising: it is due to the fact that we equip $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$ with the *induced* distance, i.e. the restriction to $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$ of the distance on $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$. Hence, the distance between two points in the hull of radius r of a map may

depend on the part of the map that lies outside of this hull (but not outside of the hull of radius $2r$). In order to obtain a similar result with $|\partial\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|$ and $|\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|$, we would need to equip $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$ with its *intrinsic* distance instead of the *induced* one (see Section 2.1 for more details about this distinction) and to prove an analog of Proposition 10 for the intrinsic distance, which we have not been able to do.

In the study of a one-parameter family of models exhibiting a critical behavior, it has become quite usual to study near-critical (scaling) limits where the parameter converges to its critical value at the right speed as the distances in the graph or the mesh of the lattice are going to zero. Understanding the near-critical limit usually sheds some light on the critical model because of the existence of scaling relations between near-critical and critical exponents. See for example the works on near-critical percolation [23, 24, 32], on the Ising model [22] or on the Erdös-Rényi random graph [4, 5].

Techniques. As we said above, the idea of the proof of Theorem 1 is to use the absolute continuity relations between the hulls of the type-I UIPT and of the hyperbolic triangulations $\mathbb{T}_\lambda$. Our main technical tool is a reinforcement of the convergence of the UIPT towards the Brownian plane. In the result below, $|\overline{B}_r(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_c})|$ and $|\partial\overline{B}_r(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_c})|$ respectively stand for the volume (number of vertices) and perimeter of the hull of radius r in the UIPT.

Theorem 2 (Extended convergence towards the Brownian plane)**.** We have the joint convergences in the local Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov sense for the first marginal and in the Skorokhod sense for the last two

$$\left(\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_c}, \left(\frac{1}{n^4}|\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_c})|\right)_{r\geq 0}, \left(\frac{1}{n^2}|\partial\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_c})|\right)_{r\geq 0}\right) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{(d)} \left(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}, \left(3|\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|\right)_{r\geq 0}, \left(\frac{3}{2}|\partial\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|\right)_{r\geq 0}\right).$$

The convergence of the first marginal has been established in the case of quadrangulations in [19] and we extend the proof to cover our case. On the other hand, the joint convergence of the last two marginals follows from the work [18] (both in the case of quadrangulations and type-I triangulations). But it is important in our Theorem 2 that those convergences hold jointly, which requires some additional work. The convergence of near-critical PSHT towards the hyperbolic Brownian plane then follows from Theorem 2 and a couple of asymptotic enumeration results gathered in Section 1.

Properties of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$. We also establish some properties of the hyperbolic Brownian plane. Since the density (2) goes to 1 as r goes to 0, the hyperbolic Brownian plane is "locally isometric" to the Brownian plane (and hence also to the Brownian map). More precisely, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ and a coupling between the Brownian plane and the hyperbolic Brownian plane such that with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$ they have the same ball of radius δ around the origin. We also prove that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ almost surely has Hausdorff dimension 4 and is homeomorphic to the plane.

The Brownian map is known to be invariant under uniform re-rooting, that is, if we resample its root uniformly according to its volume measure, the rooted metric space we obtain has the same distribution as the Brownian map. This property has played an important role in the proof of universality results in [1, 3, 10, 13, 27], and in the axiomatic characterization of the Brownian map given by [31]. Unfortunately, it makes no sense anymore when the volume measure is

infinite. However, we prove the following property of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$: for all measurable, positive function f we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h} f(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h, \rho, y)\mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h}(\mathrm{d}y)\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h} f(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h, y, \rho)\mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h}(\mathrm{d}y)\Big],$$

where ρ is the origin of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ and $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h}$ its volume measure. This property is a continuous analog of the discrete property of unimodularity, which is a natural substitute to invariance under uniform rerooting for infinite random graphs (see for example [6] for the discrete case). More precisely, the two properties are equivalent for finite random graphs. Our result shows that the hyperbolic Brownian plane is a natural surface to look at even from the purely continuum point of view.

Also, since the hyperbolic Brownian plane is a biased version of the Brownian plane, it is possible to define the perimeter P_r^h and the volume V_r^h of its hull of radius r as Curien and Le Gall did for the Brownian plane in [17]. As in [17], we identify the joint distribution of these two processes: let Z^h be the subcritical continuous-state branching process with branching mechanism

$$\psi(\lambda) = \sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}\lambda\sqrt{\lambda+3}, \qquad \lambda > 0.$$

Moreover, for all $\delta > 0$, let ν_δ be the following measure on $\mathbb{R}^+$:

$$\nu_\delta(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{\delta^3 e^{2\delta}}{1+2\delta}\frac{e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{2x}-2x}}{\sqrt{2\pi x^5}}\mathbb{1}_{x>0}\mathrm{d}x.$$

Theorem 3 (Perimeter and volume processes of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$)**.** The perimeter process P^h of the hyperbolic Brownian plane has the same distribution as the time-reversal of Z^h, started from $+\infty$ at time $-\infty$ and conditioned to die at time 0. Conditionally on P^h, the process V^h has the same distribution as the process

$$\Big(\sum_{s_i \le r} \xi_i^h\Big)_{r\ge 0},$$

where (s_i) is a measurable enumeration of the jumps of P^h, the random variables ξ_i^h are independent and ξ_i^h has distribution $\nu_{|\Delta P^h_{s_i}|}$ for all i.

This allows us to compute the asymptotics of these processes as in the discrete case in [16]:

Corollary 1 (Exponential growth)**.** We have the convergences

$$\frac{P_r^h}{e^{2\sqrt{2}r}} \xrightarrow[r\to\infty]{a.s.} \mathcal{E} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{V_r^h}{P_r^h} \xrightarrow[r\to\infty]{a.s.} \frac{1}{4},$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is an exponential variable of parameter 12.

The structure of the paper is as follows: in Section 1 we introduce the type-I analog of the PSHT and show they are the only type-I triangulations enjoying a similar domain Markov property as that defined by Curien in [16]. We also gather a few enumeration results. Section 2 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1 and 2 and Section 3 to the study of the perimeter and volume processes. Appendix A contains a technical result about the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov convergence: it shows that under some technical assumptions, if a sequence (X_n) of metric spaces converges to X, then the hulls $\overline{B}_r(X_n)$ converge to $\overline{B_r}(X)$.

Acnowledgements: I thank Nicolas Curien for suggesting me to study this object, and for carefully reading many earlier versions of this manuscript. I acknowledge the support of ANR Liouville (ANR-15-CE40-0013) and ANR GRAAL (ANR-14-CE25-0014).

Contents

1 Prerequisites: enumeration and type-I PSHT **5**
1.1 Combinatorial preliminaries 5
1.2 Definition of the type-I PSHT 6

2 Convergence to the hyperbolic Brownian plane **8**
2.1 About the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov convergence 8
2.2 Convergence of the type-I UIPT to the Brownian plane 10
2.3 Joint convergence of the perimeter process 12
2.4 The hyperbolic Brownian plane 14

3 Properties of the hyperbolic Brownian plane **17**
3.1 Local properties of the hyperbolic Brownian plane 17
3.2 Unimodularity 18
3.3 Identification of the perimeter and volume processes 20
3.4 Asymptotics for the perimeter and volume processes 25

A Proof of Proposition 10 **27**

1 Prerequisites: enumeration and type-I PSHT

1.1 Combinatorial preliminaries

In this whole work we will make repeated use of the results of [25] about the enumeration of type-I triangulations. For $p \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$, we will write $\mathscr{T}_{n,p}$ for the set of type-I triangulations of a simple p-gon with n inner vertices, and $\#\mathscr{T}_{n,p}$ for its cardinal. Since a triangulation of a p-gon with n inner vertices has $3n + 2p - 3$ edges, the main theorem of [25] in the case $r = 0$ (that is, triangulations with only one hole) can be rewritten

$$\#\mathscr{T}_{n,p} = \frac{p(2p)!}{(p!)^2} \frac{4^{n-1}(2p+3n-5)!!}{n!(2p+n-1)!!} \underset{n\to+\infty}{\sim} C(p)\lambda_c^{-n} n^{-5/2}, \tag{3}$$

where we recall that $\lambda_c = \frac{1}{12\sqrt{3}}$ and

$$C(p) = \frac{3^{p-2}p(2p)!}{4\sqrt{2\pi}(p!)^2} \underset{p\to+\infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{36\pi\sqrt{2}} 12^p \sqrt{p}. \tag{4}$$

Since a triangulation of the sphere with n vertices can be seen after a root transformation as a triangulation of a 1-gon with $n - 1$ inner vertices (see Figure 2 in [20]), the number of triangulations of the sphere with n vertices is

$$\#\mathscr{T}_{n-1,1} \underset{n\to+\infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{72\sqrt{6\pi}} \lambda_c^{-n} n^{-5/2}. \tag{5}$$

We also write $Z_p(\lambda) = \sum_{n\geq 0} \#\mathcal{T}_{n,p}\lambda^n$. Note that by the asymptotics (3), we have $Z_p(\lambda) < +\infty$ iff $\lambda \leq \lambda_c$. We finally write $G_\lambda(x) = \sum_{p\geq 0} Z_p(\lambda)x^p$. Formula (4) of [25] computes G_λ after a simple change of variables:

$$G_\lambda(x) = \frac{\lambda}{2}\Big(\Big(1 - \frac{1+8h}{h}x\Big)\sqrt{1-4(1+8h)x} - 1 + \frac{x}{\lambda}\Big), \tag{6}$$

where $h \in \big(0, \frac{1}{4}\big]$ is such that

$$\lambda = \frac{h}{(1+8h)^{3/2}}. \tag{7}$$

Note that our h corresponds to the h^3 of Krikun. From this formula we easily get

$$Z_1(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1+2h}{2\sqrt{1+8h}} \tag{8}$$

and, for $p \geq 2$,

$$Z_p(\lambda) = (2+16h)^p \frac{(2p-5)!!}{p!}\frac{(1-4h)p+6h}{4(1+8h)^{3/2}}. \tag{9}$$

We now prove a combinatorial estimate that we will use later in the proof of the convergence of the type-I UIPT to the Brownian plane.

Lemma 2. When $n, p \to +\infty$ with $p = O\big(\sqrt{n}\big)$ we have

$$\#\mathcal{T}_{n,p} \sim \frac{1}{36\pi\sqrt{2}}\lambda_c^{-n} n^{-5/2} 12^p \sqrt{p}\, \exp\Big(-\frac{2p^2}{3n}\Big).$$

Proof. This follows from developping (3) asymptotically using the Stirling formula. The same estimate for type-II triangulations can be found in the proof of Proposition 8 of [18]. Only some constants differ, and these constants for type-I triangulations are given by Section 6.1 of [18]. We omit the details here. □

1.2 Definition of the type-I PSHT

The goal of this section is to construct the analogous of the hyperbolic triangulations of [16] in the case of type-I triangulations. Since the construction is roughly the same, we only stress the differences.

Definition 3. Let $\lambda > 0$. A random (rooted) infinite type-I triangulation of the plane is λ-Markovian if there are constants $\big(C_p(\lambda)\big)_{p\geq 1}$ such that for all finite rooted triangulation t with a hole of perimeter p we have

$$\mathbb{P}\big(t \subset T\big) = C_p(\lambda)\lambda^{|t|},$$

where $|t|$ is the number of vertices of t (including those on its boundary), and by $t \subset T$ we mean that T may be obtained by filling the hole of t with an infinite triangulation of the proper perimeter.

Remark 4. Like Curien, we choose a stronger definition of the Markov property than that of Angel & Ray [8]. Although these two definitions should coincide for type-II triangulations, this is important in the context of type-I triangulations because a weaker definition would allow a much larger class of Markovian triangulations (see [8], Section 3.4 for a precise discussion in the half-planar case).

Proposition 5. If $\lambda > \lambda_c$ there is no λ-Markovian type-I triangulation. If $\lambda \leq \lambda_c$ there is a unique one (in distribution). Besides we have

$$C_p(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda}\Big(8 + \frac{1}{h}\Big)^{p-1} \sum_{q=0}^{p-1} \binom{2q}{q} h^q, \tag{10}$$

where h is like in (7). We will write $\mathbb{T}_\lambda$ for this triangulation and $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}_{\lambda_c}$, which coincides with the type-I UIPT [20, 33].

Proof. The uniqueness can be proved along the same lines as in Section 1 of [16]: the analog of relation (5) in [16] is, for all $p \geq 1$,

$$C_p(\lambda) = \lambda C_{p+1}(\lambda) + 2\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} C_{p-i}(\lambda) Z_{i+1}(\lambda). \tag{11}$$

Note that in our case, the sum starts at 0 and ends at $p-1$ (instead of 1 and $p-2$ in [16]) because of the possible presence of loops. Hence, the $\lambda \leq \lambda_c$ condition comes from the fact that the convergence radius of Z_p is λ_c by (3). If we write $F_\lambda(x) = \sum_{p\geq 0} C_p(\lambda) x^p$, then this relation becomes

$$F_\lambda(x) = \frac{\lambda}{x}\Big(F_\lambda(x) - C_1(\lambda)x\Big) + \frac{2}{x} G_\lambda(x) F_\lambda(x),$$

so

$$F_\lambda(x) = \frac{\lambda C_1(\lambda) x}{\lambda - x + 2G_\lambda(x)}. \tag{12}$$

By combining (12) and (6) we get

$$F_\lambda(x) = \frac{C_1(\lambda) x}{\Big(1 - \frac{1+8h}{h} x\Big)\sqrt{1 - 4(1+8h)x}} \tag{13}$$

and finally, for all $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_p(\lambda) &= C_1(\lambda) \sum_{q+r+1=p} \Big(\frac{1+8h}{h}\Big)^r \binom{-1/2}{q} (-4)^q (1+8h)^q \\ &= C_1(\lambda) \sum_{q=0}^{p-1} \Big(\frac{1+8h}{h}\Big)^{p-1-q} \frac{(-1)^q}{4^q} \binom{2q}{q} (-4)^q (1+8h)^q \\ &= C_1(\lambda)\Big(8 + \frac{1}{h}\Big)^{p-1} \sum_{q=0}^{p-1} \binom{2q}{q} h^q. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the uniqueness and obtain the desired formula, it only remains to prove that we must have $C_1(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda}$. Since any triangulation of the sphere can be seen as a triangulation of a 1-gon (see Figure 2 in [20]), we must have $t_0 \subset \mathbb{T}_\lambda$ with probability 1, where t_0 is the map consisting of a single loop. Hence, $C_1(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda}$.

The proof of the existence is essentially the same as in [16]: consider the sequence $\big(C_p(\lambda)\big)_{p\geq 1}$ given by (10) with $C_p(\lambda) > 0$ for all p. It verifies (11), so for all $p \geq 1$ we have

$$\lambda \frac{C_{p+1}(\lambda)}{C_p(\lambda)} + 2\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} Z_{i+1}(\lambda) \frac{C_{p-i}(\lambda)}{C_p(\lambda)} = 1.$$

The last display can be interpreted as transition probabilities for the peeling process of $\mathbb{T}_\lambda$. This allows us to construct a random triangulation by peeling like in [16]. The same arguments as in [16] prove that we get a triangulation $\mathbb{T}_\lambda$ of the plane whose distribution is independent of the peeling algorithm used for the construction and that $\mathbb{T}_\lambda$ is λ-Markovian. □

We note that in the critical case, we have a more explicit expression of $C_p(\lambda)$: we have $h = \frac{1}{4}$ so

$$C_p(\lambda_c) = \lambda_c^{-1} \times 12^{p-1} \sum_{q=0}^{p-1} \frac{1}{4^q} \binom{2q}{q} = 2\sqrt{3} \times 3^p \frac{p(2p)!}{p!^2}, \tag{14}$$

as easily proved by induction.

We will later need precise asymptotics about the numbers $C_p(\lambda)$. In this purpose, we already state the following estimate.

Lemma 6. Let $(p_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be a sequence of positive integers such that $\frac{p_n}{n^2} \to \frac{3}{2}p$ where $p \geq 0$ and $(h_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be a sequence of numbers in $\big(0, \frac{1}{4}\big]$ such that

$$h_n = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2n^2} + o\Big(\frac{1}{n^2}\Big).$$

Then we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{q=0}^{p_n-1} \binom{2q}{q} h_n^q \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^1 e^{-3px^2} \mathrm{d}x.$$

Proof. Note that if $q = \lfloor xn^2 \rfloor$ with $x \in \big(0, \frac{3}{2}p\big)$, then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \binom{2q}{q} h_n^q \underset{n\to+\infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi x}} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2p}} e^{-2x}.$$

The Riemann sums are easily seen to converge to

$$\sqrt{\frac{2}{3p}} \int_0^{3p/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi y}} e^{-2y} \mathrm{d}y,$$

which is equal to the desired integral after the change of variables $y = \frac{3p}{2}x^2$. The details are left to the reader. □

2 Convergence to the hyperbolic Brownian plane

2.1 About the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov convergence

We will need the following notation: if (X, d) is a metric space and $\alpha > 0$ we will write αX for the metric space $(X, \alpha d)$. We recall from [2] the definition of the (bipointed) Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov distance:

Definition 7. Let $\big((X_1, d_1), x_1, y_1, \mu_1\big)$ and $\big((X_2, d_2), x_2, y_2, \mu_2\big)$ be two compact bipointed measured metric spaces. We assume the measures μ_1 and μ_2 are finite (but they do not have to be probability measures). The *Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov distance* (we will sometimes write GHP distance and denote it d_{GHP}) between X_1 and X_2 is the infimum of all $\varepsilon > 0$ for which there are isometrical embeddings Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 of X_1 and X_2 in the same metric space (Z, d) such that:

a) $\Psi_1(x_1) = \Psi_2(x_2)$

b) $d\big(\Psi_1(y_1), \Psi_2(y_2)\big) \leq \varepsilon$

c) The Hausdorff distance between $\Psi_1(X_1)$ and $\Psi_2(X_2)$ is not greater than ε.

d) The Lévy–Prokhorov distance between $\mu_1 \circ \Psi_1^{-1}$ and $\mu_2 \circ \Psi_2^{-1}$ is not greater than ε.

The same definition holds for pointed measured compact metric spaces. We just need to withdraw condition b).

Definition 8. Let $\big((X_1, d_1), x_1, \mu_1\big)$ and $\big((X_2, d_2), x_2, \mu_2\big)$ be two locally compact pointed measured metric spaces. The *local Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov distance* between X_1 and X_2, that we will write $d_{LGHP}(X_1, X_2)$, is the sum

$$\sum_{r \geq 1} \frac{1}{2^r} \max\Big(1, d_{GHP}\big(B_r(X_1), B_r(X_2)\big)\Big),$$

where $B_r(X_1)$ is the closed ball of radius r centered at x_1 in X_1, equipped with the restriction of the distance d_1 and of the measure μ_1, and similarly for $B_r(X_2)$.

Definition 9. Let $\big((X, d), x, y, \mu\big)$ be a locally compact bi-pointed measured metric space. The *hull* of center x and radius r with respect to y is the union of the closed ball of radius r centered at x and all the connected components of its complementary that do not contain y. It is denoted by $\overline{B_r}(X, x, y)$, that we will write $\overline{B_r}(X)$ when there is no ambiguity. Equipped with the restriction of d and μ, it is a compact measured metric space.

If $\big((X, d), x\big)$ is unbounded and one-ended we will omit the second distinguished point: the hull will be the union of the ball of radius r centered at x and all the bounded connected components of its complementary. It means heuristically that y is at infinity.

Recall that there are two natural ways to equip a part A of (X, d) with a metric: the *induced* metric, i.e. the restriction of d to A, and the *intrisic* one, which makes A a geodesic space when it is well-defined (see [15], Chapter 2.3). In order to avoid further confusions, we insist that $\overline{B_r}(X)$ is equipped with the induced distance. If m is a map, we will also write $B_r^\bullet(m)$ for the map consisting of all the faces of m having at least one vertex at distance at most $r-1$ from the root vertex, along with all their vertices and edges. When m is seen as a metric space the hull $\overline{B_r}(m)$ has the same set of vertices but the distances inherited from m are not the same as those in $B_r^\bullet(m)$. We will always see $\overline{B_r}(m)$ as a metric space and $B_r^\bullet(m)$ as a map.

We will need several times to deduce properties of one of these distances from properties of the other. To this end, we already notice that if m is a map, then $\overline{B_r}(m)$ is a measurable function of $B_{2r}^\bullet(m)$ for all $r \geq 0$. Indeed, any geodesic in m between two vertices x and y of $\overline{B_r}(m)$ must stay in $B_{2r}^\bullet(m)$, so the distances between x and y in m and in $B_{2r}^\bullet(m)$ coincide.

We will also need the following technical result, that is proved in Appendix A:

Proposition 10. Let $\big((X_n, d_n), x_n, \mu_n\big)$ be a sequence of unbounded, locally compact measured pointed metric spaces converging for the local GHP distance to a measured metric space $\big((X, d), x, \mu\big)$. Let $r \geq 0$. We assume that:

(i) X and the X_n are one-ended length spaces,

(ii) every non-empty open subset of X has positive measure,

(iii) the function $V : s \to \mu\big(\overline{B_s}(X)\big)$ is continuous at r.

Then:

1) $\overline{B_r}(X_n)$ converge for the GHP distance to $\overline{B_r}(X)$,

2) in particular we have the convergence

$$\mu_n\big(\overline{B_r}(X_n)\big) \longrightarrow \mu\big(\overline{B_r}(X)\big).$$

2.2 Convergence of the type-I UIPT to the Brownian plane

We recall that $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}_{\lambda_c}$ is the type-I UIPT. If t is a (possibly infinite) triangulation, recall that $B_r(t)$ denotes its ball of radius r around the origin of its root edge and $\overline{B_r}(t)$ its hull, endowed with the induced metric. We denote by $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ the Brownian plane defined in [19]. Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem 2. We start with the first two marginals whereas the convergence of the third one will be the content of Section 2.3.

Proposition 11. Let $\mu_{\mathbb{T}}$ be the measure on $\mathbb{T}$ giving mass 1 to each vertex and $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}}$ the uniform mass measure on $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ [17, 19]. We have the convergence

$$\Big(\frac{1}{n^{1/4}}\mathbb{T}, \frac{1}{3n}\mu_{\mathbb{T}}\Big) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{(d)} \big(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}}\big)$$

for the local GHP distance.

We note that this result has been proved for quadrangulations in [19] for the Gromov–Hausdorff distance and in [34] for the (stronger) GHP convergence. Our main tool will be the following theorem by Curien and Le Gall. It is a refinement of the convergence of uniform type-I triangulations proved by Le Gall in [27].

Theorem 4 ([20], Appendix A1, Theorem 6)**.** Let T_n be a uniform type-I triangulation of the sphere with n vertices, μ_{T_n} the counting measure on the set of its vertices, $\mathbf{m}_\infty$ the Brownian map and $\mu_{\mathbf{m}_\infty}$ its uniform mass measure ([27]). The following convergence holds for the GHP distance:

$$\Big(\frac{1}{n^{1/4}}T_n, \frac{1}{n}\mu_{T_n}\Big) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{(d)} \Big(\frac{1}{3^{1/4}}\mathbf{m}_\infty, \mu_{\mathbf{m}_\infty}\Big).$$

To prove Proposition 11 we need to invert the local and the scaling limit, so we need the local convergence $T_n \to \mathbb{T}$ to be "uniform in the scale", which is the point of the next lemma. It parallels Proposition 1 of [19] in the case of type-I triangulations.

Proposition 12. Let $n \geq 1$ and $T_n^* = (T_n, y)$ be a uniform type-I triangulation of the sphere with n vertices equipped with a uniform distinguished vertex y. We write $B_r^\bullet(T_n^*)$ for the map made by the union of the ball of radius r centered at the root and all the connected components of its complementary in T_n^* that do not contain y. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a constant $A > 0$ such that if $n > Ar^4$, there is a coupling between T_n^* and $\mathbb{T}$ in which

$$\mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(T_n^*) = B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T})\big) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Proof. The difference with [19] is that the Schaeffer bijection is more complicated here. Hence, we need to do the computations directly on maps instead of trees as in Section 6 of [20].

Let $\delta > 0$. We know from Section 6.1 of [18] that $\frac{1}{r^4}|B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T})|$ and $\frac{1}{r^2}|\partial B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T})|$ converge in distribution to an a.s. positive random variable. Hence, there are positive constants c_δ and C_δ such that for r large enough, with probability at least $1-\delta$ we have $c_\delta\, r^2 \le |\partial B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T})| \le C_\delta\, r^2$ and $c_\delta\, r^4 \le |B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T})| \le C_\delta\, r^4$. Now take m and p such that $c_\delta\, r^2 \le p \le C_\delta r^2$ and $c_\delta\, r^4 \le m \le C_\delta r^4$. Let t be a triangulation of a p-gon with m vertices (including the boundary) such that t is a possible value of $B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T})$. On the one hand, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T}) = t\big) \underset{\text{Def } 3}{=} C_p(\lambda_c)\lambda_c^m \underset{(14)}{=} 2\sqrt{3} \times 3^p \frac{p(2p)!}{p!^2} \cdot \lambda_c^m \underset{p\to+\infty}{\sim} \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \lambda_c^m \times 12^p \sqrt{p}.$$

On the other hand, we fix $A > C_\delta$ and we take $n \ge Ar^4$. There are $n\#\mathscr{T}_{n-1,1}$ pointed triangulations of the sphere with a distinguished vertex and, if $B_r^\bullet(T_n^*) = t$, there are $\#\mathscr{T}_{n-m,p}$ ways to fill the p-gon to complete T_n^* and $n-m$ ways to choose the distinguished vertex in it, so $\mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(T_n^*) = t\big) = \frac{(n-m)\#\mathscr{T}_{n-m,p}}{n\#\mathscr{T}_{n-1,1}}$. When we let $r \to +\infty$, we have $n-m, p \to +\infty$ with $p = O\big(\sqrt{n-m}\big)$. By Lemma 2, when r goes to $+\infty$, the probability $\mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(T_n^*) = t\big)$ is equivalent to

$$\frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \lambda_c^m \times 12^p \sqrt{p} \exp\Big(-\frac{2p^2}{3(n-m)}\Big) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\sim} \exp\Big(-\frac{2p^2}{3(n-m)}\Big) \mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T}) = t\big).$$

Hence, if we have chosen A large enough, the following holds:

$$(1-\delta)\mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T}) = t\big) \le \mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(T_n^*) = t\big) \le (1+\delta)\mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(T) = t\big),$$

as soon as $c_\delta r^2 \le |\partial t| \le C_\delta r^2$ and $c_\delta r^4 \le |t| \le C_\delta r^4$. But since $B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T})$ satisfies these assumptions with probability at least $1-\delta$, we can easily prove that for $n \ge Ar^4$ and any set B of finite maps we have

$$\big|\mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T}) \in B\big) - \mathbb{P}\big(B_r^\bullet(T_n^*) \in B\big)\big| \le 4\delta.$$

This shows that the total variation distance between the distributions of $B_r^\bullet(\mathbb{T})$ and $B_r^\bullet(T_n^*)$ is less than 4δ for r large enough and $n \ge Ar^4$, and proves the proposition. □

Proof of Proposition 11. We use Proposition 12 with $2r$ instead of r. The metric spaces $B_r(T_n^*)$ and $B_r(\mathbb{T})$ (equipped with the induced distance) are measurable functions of respectively $B_{2r}^\bullet(T_n^*)$ and $B_{2r}^\bullet(\mathbb{T})$. Hence, Proposition 12 still holds if we replace the maps $B_r^\bullet$ by the metric spaces B_r. The proof is now the same as the proof of Theorem 2 in [19] with two small modifications:

- We deal with Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov convergence and not only Gromov–Hausdorff, but this does not change anything in the details of the proof, see [34] for details.
- The constant factors are not the same: because of the factor $\frac{1}{3^{1/4}}$ in Theorem 4 the measured space $\Big(\frac{1}{n^{1/4}}\mathbb{T}, \frac{1}{n}\mu_{\mathbb{T}}\Big)$ converge to $\big(\frac{1}{3^{1/4}}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}}\big)$ which has the same distribution as $\big(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}, 3\mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}}\big)$ by the scaling property of the Brownian plane.

□

We can now prove the joint convergence of the first two marginals in Theorem 2.

Proposition 13. We have the joint convergence

$$\left(\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}, \left(\frac{1}{n^4}|\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T})|\right)_{r\geq 0}\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{(d)} \left(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}, \left(3|\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|\right)_{r\geq 0}\right)$$

where the convergence of the first marginal is for the local GHP distance and the second one for the local Skorokhod distance.

We will deduce Proposition 13 from Proposition 11 thanks to the second point of Proposition 10. Let us check this carefully.

Proof of Proposition 13. By the Skorokhod representation theorem we may assume the convergence in Proposition 11 is almost sure. Theorem 1.4 of [17] implies that $\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-|\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|}\right]$ is a continuous function of r. Since the process $\left(|\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|\right)_{r\geq 0}$ has only positive jumps it means that for all r, it is almost surely continuous at r. Finally, the Brownian plane is defined in [19] as a quotient of $\mathbb{R}$, i.e. there is a continuous surjection from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ and the measure on $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ is the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure under this surjection. The inverse-image of a non-empty open subset of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ is a non-empty open subset of $\mathbb{R}$, so it has positive measure, which means that any non-empty open subset of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ has positive measure.

Instead of $\mathbb{T}$ we can consider the metric space $\mathbb{T}^e$ which is the union of all the vertices and edges of $\mathbb{T}$ equipped with the metric that makes it a geodesic space in which all edges have length 1 and also equipped with the counting measure $\mu_{\mathbb{T}}$ on the set of vertices. We have $d_{GHP}(B_r(\mathbb{T}), B_r(\mathbb{T}^e)) \leq 1$ for all r so $d_{LGHP}\left(\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/4}}\mathbb{T}, \frac{1}{3n}\mu_{\mathbb{T}}\right), \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/4}}\mathbb{T}^e, \frac{1}{3n}\mu_{\mathbb{T}^e}\right)\right) \leq \frac{2}{n^{1/4}}$, and Proposition 11 still holds if we replace $\mathbb{T}$ by $\mathbb{T}^e$. The sequence $\left(\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}^e, \frac{1}{n^4}\mu_{\mathbb{T}}\right)$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 10, so for all $(r_1, \dots, r_k)$ we have

$$\forall i \in [\![1,k]\!], \frac{1}{3n^4}\mu_{\mathbb{T}}\left(\overline{B_{r_i n}}(\mathbb{T})\right) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{a.s.} \mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}}\left(\overline{B_{r_i}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})\right),$$

which gives the joint convergence of $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}$ and of the finite-dimensional marginals of the process of volumes.

Proposition 11 proves that the first variable in the statement of Proposition 13 is tight and Theorem 2 of [18] proves that the process of volumes is tight, which ends the proof of Proposition 13. □

2.3 Joint convergence of the perimeter process

The goal of this subsection is to prove the joint convergence of the last marginal in Theorem 2.

Proof. By Proposition 13, the first two marginal converge in distribution to $\left(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}, \left(3V_r\right)_{r\geq 0}\right)$, where $V_r = |\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|$. We also know by Theorem 2 of [18] that $\left(\left(\frac{1}{n^2}|\partial\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T})|\right)_{r\geq 0}\right)_{n\geq 0}$ is tight, so the triplet is tight. Let (n_k) be a subsequence along which it converges in distribution to a triplet

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}, \left(3V_r\right)_{r\geq 0}, \left(\frac{3}{2}\widetilde{P}_r\right)_{r\geq 0}\right),$$

where $\widetilde{P}$ is càdlàg process. We also write $P_r = |\partial\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|$, and we want to show $\widetilde{P} = P$.

On the one hand, by Theorem 1.3 of [17], there is a measurable enumeration (s_i) of the jumps of P and an i.i.d. sequence (ξ_i) of variables with distribution $\nu(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{e^{-1/2x}}{\sqrt{2\pi x^5}} \mathbb{1}_{x>0}\,\mathrm{d}x$ such that for all $r \geq 0$ we have

$$V_r = \sum_{s_i \leq r} \xi_i (\Delta P_{s_i})^2.$$

On the other hand, Theorem 2 of [18] (see Section 6.1 of [18] for the computation of the constants for type-I triangulations) gives the distribution of the couple $(\widetilde{P}_r, V_r)_{r\geq 0}$. We get

$$(\widetilde{P}_r, V_r)_{r\geq 0} \overset{(d)}{=} (P_r, V_r)_{r\geq 0}.$$

To prove that $\widetilde{P}_r = P_r$, we show that it is possible to "track back" P_r from the process $(V_r)_{r\geq 0}$, which is done in the following lemma. We will need the following notation: for a nondecreasing function f and $a, b, h \in \mathbb{R}^+$ with $a \leq b$, we write $N_a^b(f, h)$ for the number of jumps of f in $[a, b]$ of height at least h.

Lemma 14. For all $r \geq 0$ we have

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \delta^{-1} \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \varepsilon^{3/4} N_r^{r+\delta}(V, \varepsilon) = cP_r$$

almost surely, where $c = \frac{2^{1/4}}{\pi\sqrt{3}}\Gamma\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)$.

Once this lemma is proved, Theorem 2 follows easily: since $(\widetilde{P}, V) \overset{(d)}{=} (P, V)$, for all r the variables $\widetilde{P}_r$ and P_r are both the almost sure limits of the same quantity, so a.s., $\widetilde{P}_r = P_r$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}^+$. Since $\widetilde{P}$ and P are càdlàg we have $\widetilde{P} = P$ a.s. Hence, the sequence of triplets has only one subsequential limit, which proves the theorem. □

Remark 15. Note that Proposition 1.1 of [17] provides another way to "read" P on the measured metric space $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$, but it involves the volumes of the balls $B_{r+\varepsilon}$, which are not given by the process V. Our lemma is also quite similar to the main theorem of [28], although much easier to prove.

Proof of Lemma 14. Let S^+ be the stable spectrally negative Lévy process of index $\frac{3}{2}$, normalized such that its characteristic exponent is $\psi(\lambda) = \sqrt{8/3}\,\lambda^{3/2}$, conditioned to be positive. Let also (t_i) be a measurable enumeration of the jumps of S^+ and (ξ_i') a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with distribution ν. We write

$$Q_r^+ = \sum_{t_i \leq r} \xi_i' (\Delta S_{t_i}^+)^2.$$

We first show that almost surely, for any $0 < a < b$ we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \varepsilon^{3/4} N_a^b(Q^+, \varepsilon) = c(b - a). \tag{15}$$

It is enough to prove it for $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}_+^*$. Let Q be the same process as Q^+ but constructed from a non-conditioned stable Lévy process S instead of S^+. Then Q is a subordinator whose Lévy measure σ is the image of $\mu \otimes \nu$ under $(x, y) \to x^2 y$, where μ is the Lévy measure of S. An easy computation shows that $\sigma([\varepsilon, +\infty[) = c\varepsilon^{-3/4}$ for all ε, so equation (15) for Q instead of Q^+ follows from a law of large numbers. But since S^+ is absolutely continuous with respect to S on $[a, b]$, equation (15) also holds for Q^+.

We now recall the law of (P,V) as described in Section 4.4 of [18]. It has the same distribution as $(S^+_{\tau_r}, Q^+_{\tau_r})_{r\geq 0}$ where $\tau_r = \inf\{s\geq 0 | \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{S^+_u} \geq r\}$. Hence, we have $N_r^{r+\delta}(V,\varepsilon) = N_{\tau_r}^{\tau_{r+\delta}}(Q^+,\varepsilon)$. By (15), for any r and δ we have (we can take a and b random as long as they are positive)

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \varepsilon^{3/4} N_{\tau_r}^{\tau_{r+\delta}}(Q^+,\varepsilon) = c(\tau_{r+\delta}-\tau_r).$$

Now, it is easy to see by the right-continuity of Q^+ at τ_r that $\delta^{-1}(\tau_{r+\delta}-\tau_r) \xrightarrow[\delta\to 0]{a.s.} Q^+_{\tau_r} = P_r$. This finishes the proof. □

2.4 The hyperbolic Brownian plane

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1. We will write

$$\varphi(p,v) = e^{-2v}e^p \int_0^1 e^{-3px^2}\mathrm{d}x$$

in the whole proof of the theorem.

Proposition 16. Let (λ_n) be a sequence of numbers in $\big(0,\lambda_c\big]$ that satisfies (1). Let $r>0$ and (p_n) and (v_n) be two sequences of positive integers such that $\frac{p_n}{n^2}\to\frac{3}{2}p$ and $\frac{v_n}{n^4}\to 3v$. For every n, let t_n be a type-I triangulation of a p_n-gon with v_n vertices such that $\mathbb{P}\big(B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T})=t_n\big)>0$. Then

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\big(B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})=t_n\big)}{\mathbb{P}\big(B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T})=t_n\big)} \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} \varphi(p,v).$$

Proof. This is just a matter of gathering our estimates in Section 1.1 and 1.2 together. Let us proceed: for every n, let $h_n\in\big(0,\frac{1}{4}\big]$ be such that $\lambda_n = \frac{h_n}{(1+8h_n)^{3/2}}$. It is easy to check that

$$h_n = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2n^2} + o\Big(\frac{1}{n^2}\Big). \tag{16}$$

We know from (10) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{P}\big(B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})=t_n\big)}{\mathbb{P}\big(B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T})=t_n\big)} &\underset{\text{Def. }3}{=} \frac{\lambda_n^{v_n} C_{p_n}(\lambda_n)}{\lambda_c^{v_n} C_{p_n}(\lambda_c)} \\
&\underset{(14)}{=} \Big(\frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_c}\Big)^{v_n} \frac{{p_n!}^2}{2\sqrt{3}\times 3^{p_n} p_n (2p_n)!} \frac{1}{\lambda_n}\Big(8+\frac{1}{h_n}\Big)^{p_n-1} \sum_{q=0}^{p_n-1}\binom{2q}{q} h_n^q \\
&= \Big(\frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_c}\Big)^{3vn^4+o(n^4)} \Big(\frac{2}{3}+\frac{1}{12h_n}\Big)^{p_n-1} \frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_n}\frac{4^{p_n}{p_n!}^2}{2p_n(2p_n)!} \sum_{q=0}^{p_n-1}\binom{2q}{q} h_n^q.
\end{aligned}$$

The first factor converges to e^{-2v} because $\frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_c} = 1-\frac{2}{3n^4}+o\Big(\frac{1}{n^4}\Big)$. The second factor is also easy to estimate:

$$\Big(\frac{2}{3}+\frac{1}{12h_n}\Big)^{p_n-1} = \Big(1+\frac{2}{3n^2}+o\Big(\frac{1}{n^2}\Big)\Big)^{\frac{3p}{2}n^2+o(n^2)} \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} e^p.$$

The third one converges to one. By the Stirling formula, we have $\frac{4^{p_n}{p_n!}^2}{2p_n(2p_n)!} \sim \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2\sqrt{p_n}}$. Finally, Lemma 6 gives an asymptotic equivalent of the last factor and we are done. □

The last proposition is more or less equivalent to the vague convergence. We now need to show that no mass "escapes" at infinity, i.e that the total mass of the limit measure is 1.

Lemma 17. Recall that $P_r = |\partial\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|$ and $V_r = |\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})|$. For every $r \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\varphi(V_r, P_r)\big] = 1.$$

Proof. We use the expression of the Laplace transform of (P_r, V_r) that is computed in [17]. First, we apply Theorem 1.4 of [17] with $\mu = 2$:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\exp(-2V_r)\Big|P_r = \ell\Big] = 2\sqrt{2}r^3\frac{\cosh(\sqrt{2}r)}{\sinh^3(\sqrt{2}r)}\exp\Big(-\ell\Big(3\coth^2(\sqrt{2}r) - 2 - \frac{3}{2r^2}\Big)\Big).$$

We now apply Fubini's theorem and Theorem 1.2 of [17]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\big[\varphi(V_r, P_r)\big] &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\big[\exp(-2V_r)\big|P_r\big]\exp\big(P_r\big)\int_0^1 \exp\big(-3P_r x^2\big)\mathrm{d}x\Big] \\
&= 2\sqrt{2}r^3\frac{\cosh(\sqrt{2}r)}{\sinh^3(\sqrt{2}r)}\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\Big(-P_r\Big(3\coth^2(\sqrt{2}r) - 2 - \frac{3}{2r^2}\Big)\Big)\exp\Big((1-3x^2)P_r\Big)\right]\mathrm{d}x \\
&= 2\sqrt{2}r^3\frac{\cosh(\sqrt{2}r)}{\sinh^3(\sqrt{2}r)}\int_0^1 \left(1 + \frac{2r^2}{3}\Big(3\coth^2(\sqrt{2}r) - 2 - \frac{3}{2r^2} - 1 + 3x^2\Big)\right)^{-3/2}\mathrm{d}x \\
&= 2\sqrt{2}r^3\frac{\cosh(\sqrt{2}r)}{\sinh^3(\sqrt{2}r)}\int_0^1 \left(2r^2\coth^2(\sqrt{2}r) - 2r^2 + 2r^2x^2\right)^{-3/2}\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \frac{\cosh(\sqrt{2}r)}{\sinh^3(\sqrt{2}r)}\int_0^1 \Big(\frac{1}{\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}r)} + x^2\Big)^{-3/2}\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \cosh(\sqrt{2}r)\int_0^1 \Big(1 + \sinh^2(\sqrt{2}r)x^2\Big)^{-3/2}\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \cosh(\sqrt{2}r)\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}r)}} \\
&= 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where at the end we used the fact that $(1+ax^2)^{-3/2}$ is the derivative of $\frac{x}{\sqrt{1+ax^2}}$. □

Our main theorem is now easy to prove.

Proof of Theorem 1. In this proof, if X is a measured metric space, we will write $\frac{1}{n}X$ for the metric space obtained from X by multiplying all distances by $\frac{1}{n}$ and the measure by $\frac{1}{3n^4}$.

Let $r > 0$ and $\mathbb{T}$ be a type-I UIPT: almost surely, the processes P and V have no jump at r and at $2r$ so we have convergence of the one-dimensional marginal at $2r$ in Theorem 2. By the Skorokhod representation theorem we may assume, as $n \to +\infty$, the convergence

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcll}
 & & \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T} & \xrightarrow[LGHP]{a.s.} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}} \\
P'_n & := & \frac{1}{n^2}|\partial\overline{B_{2rn}}(\mathbb{T})| & \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{3}{2}P_{2r} \\
V'_n & := & \frac{1}{n^4}|\overline{B_{2rn}}(\mathbb{T})| & \xrightarrow{a.s.} 3V_{2r}.
\end{array}\right.$$

We have already verified in the proof of Theorem 13 that the assumptions of Proposition 10 were satisfied. By the first point of Proposition 10, the convergence of $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}$ to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ implies

$$\frac{1}{n}\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}) \xrightarrow[GHP]{a.s.} \overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}).$$

Let $\mathscr{G}$ denote the GHP space and f be a bounded, continuous function from $\mathscr{G}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$. Since the space $\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T})$ is a measurable function of the map $B^\bullet_{2rn}(\mathbb{T})$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[f\Big(\frac{1}{n}\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\Big)\Big] &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\widetilde{f}\big(B^\bullet_{2rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\big)\Big] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\varphi_{\lambda_n}(P'_n,V'_n)\widetilde{f}\big(B^\bullet_{2rn}(\mathbb{T})\big)\Big] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\varphi_{\lambda_n}(P'_n,V'_n)f\Big(\frac{1}{n}\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T})\Big)\Big],\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\varphi_\lambda(p,v)=\frac{\mathbb{P}\big(t\subset\mathbb{T}_\lambda\big)}{\mathbb{P}\big(t\subset\mathbb{T}\big)}$$

if t is a triangulation with v vertices and a simple hole of perimeter p. By Proposition 16 and the continuity of f, the expression inside the expectation converges almost surely to $\varphi\big(P_{2r},V_{2r}\big)f\big(\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})\big)$. By Fatou, we have

$$\liminf_n \mathbb{E}\Big[f\Big(\frac{1}{n}\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\Big)\Big]\geq\mathbb{E}\Big[\varphi\big(P_{2r},V_{2r}\big)f\big(\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})\big)\Big]. \tag{17}$$

Let $M\in\mathbb{R}^+$ be such that $f\leq M$. By Lemma 17 we have:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[M\varphi\big(P_{2r},V_{2r}\big)\Big]=M$$

so by applying (17) to $M-f$ we get the reverse inequality, which shows that $\frac{1}{n}\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ converges in distribution to the random metric space having density $\varphi\big(P_{2r},V_{2r}\big)$ with respect to $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$. We denote this space by $\overline{B_r}^h$.

Moreover, let $0<s\leq r$. We can take points y_n on the boundary of $\frac{1}{n}\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ and $y\in\overline{B_r}^h$ such that $\Big(\frac{1}{n}\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}),y_n\Big)$ converges in distribution to $\big(\overline{B_r}^h,y\big)$. By Proposition 10 we have

$$\overline{B_s}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\Big)\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{(d)}\overline{B_s}\big(\overline{B_r}^h\big),$$

where the hulls are taken with respect to y_n and y respectively. More precisely, we use here Proposition 10 in the compact, bipointed case. But $\overline{B_s}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\overline{B_{rn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\Big)=\overline{B_{sn}}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$, which converges in distribution to $\overline{B_s}^h$ so we have

$$\overline{B_s}\big(\overline{B_r}^h\big)\overset{(d)}{=}\overline{B_s}^h,$$

i.e. the $\overline{B_r}^h$ are "consistent". By the Kolmogorov extension theorem, there is a random metric space that we write $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ such that $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)\overset{(d)}{=}\overline{B_r}^h$ for all $r\geq 0$, and we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}\xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{(d)}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$$

for the local GHP distance. □

3 Properties of the hyperbolic Brownian plane

3.1 Local properties of the hyperbolic Brownian plane

The absolute continuity relation between the Brownian plane and the hyperbolic Brownian plane implies that they have the same almost sure "local" properties. This gives us the two following properties of the space $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$.

Proposition 18. Almost surely, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ has Hausdorff dimension 4 and is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Proof. First, by the absolute continuity relation with the Brownian plane, for all r the space $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)$ has a.s. Hausdorff dimension 4 and so does $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$.

Now, for all $r > 0$ we write $U_r = \bigcup_{\varepsilon>0} \overline{B_{r-\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$. The set U_r is a connected, open subset of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$, and it is quite easy to prove that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}\backslash U_r$ is connected ($\overline{B_{r+1}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})\backslash U_r$ is connected because it is the decreasing intersection of the $\overline{B_{r+1}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})\backslash\overline{B_{r-\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$ which are compact, connected subsets).

The set U_r is a connected subset of the plane whose complement is connected, so it is homeomorphic to the open unit disk (it is a consequence of the Riemann mapping theorem). In particular, almost surely, for all $x \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $d(\rho, x) < r$ there is a neighbourhood of x that is homeomorphic to the unit disk, and any loop in $B_r(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$ is contractible. By the absolute continuity relation, this is also true in $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$, so $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ is a noncompact, simply connected topological surface, so it is homeomorphic to the plane (for example it is a consequence of the Riemann uniformization theorem and the fact that any topological surface may be equipped with a Riemann surface structure).

Note that in this proof it was important to consider U_r and not $\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$: a closed half-plane rooted at an interior point is not homeomorphic to the plane, although all its hulls are homeomorphic to the closed unit disk. □

The results about the local confluence of geodesics in the Brownian map and the Brownian plane also hold for the hyperbolic Brownian plane for the same reason as above.

Proposition 19. Almost surely, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that all the geodesics in $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ from the root to a point at distance at least ε from the root share a common initial segment of length at least δ.

Finally, the Brownian map, the Brownian plane and the hyperbolic Brownian plane are locally isometric in the following sense.

Proposition 20. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that it is possible to couple the Brownian map, the Brownian plane and the hyperbolic Brownian plane in such a way that their hulls of radius δ coincide with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$.

Proof. The result for the Brownian map and the Brownian plane is Theorem 1 of [19], so we only need to prove it for $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$. Let $\delta > 0$ and A be a mesurable subset of the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov space. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\mathbb{P}\big(\overline{B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h) \in A\big) - \mathbb{P}\big(\overline{B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}) \in A\big)\right| &= \left|\mathbb{E}\big[\varphi(P_\delta, V_\delta)\mathbb{1}_{\overline{B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)\in A}\big] - \mathbb{P}\big(\overline{B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}) \in A\big)\right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\big[|\varphi(P_\delta, V_\delta) - 1|\big],\end{aligned}$$

which goes to 0 as $\delta \to 0$. Hence, the total variation distance between the distributions of $\overline{B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)$ and $\overline{B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$ goes to 0 as $\delta \to 0$, which proves the result by the maximal coupling theorem (see Section 2 of [21]). □

3.2 Unimodularity

The goal of this section is to prove that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ satisfies a property that is the continuum analog of unimodularity for random graphs.

Proposition 21. Let ρ be the root of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$ and $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h}$ its volume measure. For any measurable function f from the space of locally compact, bipointed measured metric spaces to $\mathbb{R}^+$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h} f(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h, \rho, y)\mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h}(\mathrm{d}y)\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h} f(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h, y, \rho)\mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h}(\mathrm{d}y)\Big].$$

To prove this result we will need the following lemma. It roughly means that the degree of the root is independent of the large-scale geometry of the map.

Lemma 22. As earlier, we write $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$ for the set of the vertices of $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$ equipped with $\frac{1}{n}$ times its graph distance and the measure giving mass $\frac{1}{3n^4}$ to each vertex. Let ρ_n be the origin of the root edge of $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$. We have the convergence

$$\Big(\deg(\rho_n), \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}\Big) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{(d)} \big(D, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h\big)$$

where D has the same distribution as the degree of the root in the UIPT and is independent of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$.

Proof. The convergence of the first marginal is obvious. Hence, it is enough to prove that for all d, the spaces $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$ conditioned on $\deg(\rho_n) = d$ converge in distribution to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$. More genrerally, we prove that for all finite triangulation t that is a possible value of $B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T})$, the spaces $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$ conditioned on $B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}) = t$ converge to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$. Since the GHP distance between $B_r(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ and $B_r(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\backslash B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ is tight, the GHP distance between $B_r\Big(\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}\Big)$ and $B_r\Big(\frac{1}{n}\big(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}\backslash B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\big)\Big)$ goes to 0 in probability. Hence, it is enough to prove the lemma for $\frac{1}{n}\big(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}\backslash B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\big)$ instead of $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$. But by the spatial Markov property of $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$, the distribution of $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}\backslash B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ conditionally on $B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ only depends on $|\partial B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})|$.

We now fix a deterministic peeling algorithm (see [7] or [18]) and we explore $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$ using this algorithm. For all $p \geq 1$ we write τ_p for the first time at which the perimeter of the discovered map is equal to p. Note that since $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$ may be identified with an infinite triangulation of a 1-gon, the times τ_p are a.s. finite even for $p = 1$ or $p = 2$. We also write $D_p(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ for the triangulation discovered at time τ_p. By the spatial Markov property, the map $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}\backslash B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ conditionally on $|\partial B_1^\bullet(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})| = p$ has the same distribution as $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}\backslash D_p(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$, so it is enough to prove that for all p, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\big(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}\backslash D_p(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\big) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{(d)} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h.$$

This easily follows from Theorem 1 and the fact that for all r, the GHP distance between $B_r(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ and $B_r(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\backslash D_p(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ is at most $\big|D_p(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\big|$, which is tight. □

We now move on to the proof of Proposition 21.

Proof. We claim that it is enough to prove the result for functions f such that:

(i) there is an $r \geq 0$ such that if the distance between x and y is greater than r then $f(X, x, y) = 0$,

(ii) there is a $v > 0$ such that if one of the balls of radius r centered at x or y has a volume greater than v then $f(X, x, y) = 0$,

(iii) there is an $s > r$ such that $f(X, x, y)$ only depends on the intersection of the balls of radius s around x and y in X, bipointed at x and y,

(iv) f is bounded and uniformly continuous for the (bipointed) GHP distance (by assumption (iii), $f(X)$ may be seen as a function of a ball of radius r in X so we do not need the LGHP distance).

Indeed, if the theorem is true for all such functions, then by the monotone convergence theorem it is true for all indicator functions of open events satisfying (i), (ii) and (iii). By the monotone class theorem, it is true for the indicator functions of any event satisfying (i), (ii) and (iii). But by the monotone class theorem again, for any event A whose indicator function satisfies (i) and (ii) and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an event B whose indicator function satisfies (i), (ii) and (iii) that approximates A in the following sense:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h} \mathbb{1}_{A\Delta B}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h, \rho, y)\, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h}(\mathrm{d}y)\Big] \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence, we can get rid of assumption (iii). We can then get rid of assumptions (i) and (ii) by monotone convergence, so the result is true for any indicator function, and finally for any positive measurable function.

Let (λ_n) be a sequence satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1. We first remark that the triangulations $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$ are invariant by rerooting along the simple random walk. This is the type-I analog of (a part of) Proposition 9 in [16] and the proof is exactly the same. We write $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{\lambda_n}$ for the map $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}$ biased by the inverse of the degree of its root ρ_n. By Proposition 2.5 of [11], it is unimodular. Hence, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{3n^4}\sum_{y\in\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}} f\Big(\frac{1}{n}\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{\lambda_n}, \rho_n, y\Big)\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{3n^4}\sum_{y\in\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}} f\Big(\frac{1}{n}\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{\lambda_n}, y, \rho_n\Big)\Big],$$

where ρ_n is the root vertex of $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{\lambda_n}$. We may restrict ourselves to $y \in B_{rn}(\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{\lambda_n})$ thanks to assumption (i). The last equation can be rewritten

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{\deg(\rho_n)}\frac{1}{3n^4}\sum_{y\in B_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})} f\Big(\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}, \rho_n, y\Big)\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{1}{\deg(\rho_n)}\frac{1}{3n^4}\sum_{y\in B_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})} f\Big(\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}, y, \rho_n\Big)\Big].$$

Hence, in order to prove the proposition it is enough to prove that the left-hand side converges as n goes to $+\infty$ to the left-hand side in the statement of the proposition, multiplied by $\mathbb{E}\big[\frac{1}{D}\big]$ (the proof of the same fact for the right-hand side will be similar). By the Skorokhod representation theorem, we may assume the convergence in Lemma 22 is almost sure. By the dominated convergence theorem (the domination follows from assumption (ii) and the fact that f is bounded) it is enough to prove

$$\frac{1}{3n^4}\sum_{y\in B_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})} f\Big(\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n}, \rho_n, y\Big) \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{a.s.} \int_{B_r(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)} f(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h, \rho, y)\mu_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h}(dy). \tag{18}$$

This follows from assumptions (iii) and (iv) and the GHP convergence of $\frac{1}{n}B_{(r+s)n}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ to $B_{(r+s)}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)$. □

Remark 23. The same result is true for the Brownian plane and the proof is the same, the only change is that we need to use Proposition 11 instead of Theorem 1.

3.3 Identification of the perimeter and volume processes

In what follows, if X is an adapted process and M a martingale for the underlying filtration, by "Y is the process X biased by M" we will mean that for all $r_0 > 0$, the process $(Y_r)_{0\le r\le r_0}$ has the same distribution as $(X_r)_{0\le r\le r_0}$ biased by M_{r_0}. The martingale property of M shows the consistence for different values of r_0.

The hyperbolic Brownian plane is a biased version of the Brownian plane. Hence, it is naturally equipped with a perimeter and a volume process inherited from those of the Brownian plane, that we write $\left(P^h_r\right)_{r\ge0}$ and $\left(V^h_r\right)_{r\ge0}$. More precisely, the proof of Theorem 1 gives the following joint convergences in distribution, where the first one is for the local GHP distance and the two others for the local Skorokhod distance:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n} & \longrightarrow & \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h \\ \left(\frac{1}{n^2}\left|\partial B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\right|\right)_{r\ge0} & \longrightarrow & \left(\frac{3}{2}P^h_r\right)_{r\ge0} \\ \left(\frac{1}{n^4}\left|B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\right|\right)_{r\ge0} & \longrightarrow & \left(3V^h_r\right)_{r\ge0}, \end{cases}$$

where for all r_0, the triplet $\left(\overline{B_{r_0}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h), \left(P^h_r\right)_{0\le r\le r_0}, \left(V^h_r\right)_{0\le r\le r_0}\right)$ has the same distribution as $\left(\overline{B_{r_0}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}), \left(P_r\right)_{0\le r\le r_0}, \left(V_r\right)_{0\le r\le r_0}\right)$ biased by $\varphi(P_{2r_0}, V_{2r_0})$.

In particular, these two triplets have the same a.s. properties as for the Brownian plane, so P^h and V^h are both càdlàg processes and can be expressed as measurable functions of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h$: we have $V^h_r = |\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)|$ for all r and Proposition 1.1 of [17] gives the convergence

$$\varepsilon^{-2}|B_{r+\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)\backslash\overline{B_r}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}^h)| \underset{\varepsilon\to0}{\longrightarrow} P^h_r$$

in probability.

On the other hand, the perimeter and volume of the map $B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$ only depend on $B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})$. Hence, if we apply the proof of Theorem 1 to the pair $\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\left|\partial B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\right|, \frac{1}{n^4}\left|B^\bullet_{rn}(\mathbb{T}_{\lambda_n})\right|\right)_{r\ge0}$ instead of the triplet, we only need to bias by $\varphi(P_{r_0}, V_{r_0})$ instead of $\varphi(P_{2r_0}, V_{2r_0})$. We obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 24. The pair of processes (P^h, V^h) has the same distribution as (P, V) biased by $\varphi(P, V)$.

The goal of this section is to identify the two processes P^h and V^h in a more convenient way as expressed in Theorem 3. We will first prove the second part of the theorem, that is, we determine the distribution of V^h conditionally on P^h: we recall that for all $\delta > 0$, the measure ν_δ on $\mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\nu_\delta(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{\delta^3 e^{2\delta}}{1+2\delta}\frac{e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{2x}-2x}}{\sqrt{2\pi x^5}}\mathbb{1}_{x>0}\mathrm{d}x.$$

If $\xi^h(\delta)$ is a random variable with distribution ν_δ, we have for all $\beta \ge 0$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\beta\xi^h(\delta)}\right] = \frac{(1+\delta\sqrt{4+2\beta})e^{-\delta\sqrt{4+2\beta}}}{(1+2\delta)e^{-2\delta}}. \tag{19}$$

Notice for further use that $\xi^h(\delta)$ has the same distribution as $\delta^2\xi$ biased by $e^{-2\delta^2\xi}$, where ξ is a random variable with density $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi x^5}}e^{-1/2x}\mathbb{1}_{x>0}\,\mathrm{d}x$, as in [18].

Proof of Theorem 3. We fix $r_0 > 0$. We write $D([0,r_0])$ for the Skorokhod space on $[0,r_0]$. We write $g(p) = e^p\int_0^1 e^{-3x^2p}\mathrm{d}x$. Let $t_1, t_2, \dots$ (resp. $t_1^h, t_2^h, \dots$) be the (random) jump times of the process P (resp. P^h) up to time r_0, ordered by decreasing size of jumps $|\Delta P_{t_i}|$. For any measurable function $f : D([0,r_0]) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and $u_1, u_2, \dots \geq 0$, by Lemma 24 we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[f\big((P^h_r)_{0\leq r\leq r_0}\big)\exp\Big(-\sum_{i\geq 0}u_i|\Delta V^h_{t_i^h}|\Big)\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[f\big((P_r)_{0\leq r\leq r_0}\big)g(P_{r_0})\exp\Big(-\sum_{i\geq 0}(u_i+2)|\Delta V^h_{t_i^h}|\Big)\Big] \tag{20}$$

since V is a pure jump process and only jumps at jump times of P.

Conditionally on P the jumps ΔV_{t_i} are independent, of distribution $\big(\Delta P_{t_i}\big)^2\xi$ with $\xi \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi x^5}}e^{-1/2x}\mathbb{1}_{x>0}\,\mathrm{d}x$, so the last display can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}\Bigg[f\big((P_r)_{0\leq r\leq r_0}\big)g(P_{r_0})\prod_{i\geq 0}\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-2(\Delta P_{t_i})^2\xi}|\Delta P_{t_i}\big]\frac{\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-(u_i+2)(\Delta P_{t_i})^2\xi}|\Delta P_{t_i}\big]}{\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-2(\Delta P_{t_i})^2\xi}|\Delta P_{t_i}\big]}\Bigg]. \tag{21}$$

From the distribution of ξ we compute easily for $\alpha \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-2\alpha^2\xi}\big] = (1+2\alpha)e^{-2\alpha}.$$

By combining this with Equation (19), (21) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[f\big((P_r)_{0\leq r\leq r_0}\big)g(P_{r_0})\prod_{i\geq 0}(1+2|\Delta P_{t_i}|)e^{-2|\Delta P_{t_i}|}\prod_{i\geq 0}\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-u_i\xi^h(|\Delta P_{t_i}|)}|\Delta P_{t_i}\big]\Big],$$

where $\xi^h(\delta)$ has law ν_δ.

This expression shows two things: it proves point 2) of Theorem 3, that is, conditionally on $(P^h_r)_{0\leq r\leq r_0}$, the jumps $\Delta V^h_{t_i^h}$ are independent of law $\nu_{|\Delta P^h_{t_i^h}|}$. It also proves that the density of the process $(P^h_r)_{0\leq r\leq r_0}$ with respect to $(P_r)_{0\leq r\leq r_0}$ is given by

$$g(P_{r_0})\prod_{i\geq 0}(1+2|\Delta P_{t_i}|)e^{-2|\Delta P_{t_i}|}. \tag{22}$$

We now move on to characterizing the law of P^h in a nicer way. Since we know that P is a reversed branching process with mechanism $\sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}u^{3/2}$, it seems natural to first study the effect of the density (22) on its associated Lévy process. So let S be the spectrally *positive* $\frac{3}{2}$-stable Lévy process, normalized in such a way that for all $t, u \geq 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-uS_t}\big] = \exp\Big(\sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}tu^{3/2}\Big) = \exp\Big(t\int_0^{+\infty}(e^{-ux}-1+ux)\mu(\mathrm{d}x)\Big),$$

where $\mu(\mathrm{d}x) = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2\pi}}x^{-5/2}\mathbb{1}_{x>0}\,\mathrm{d}x$.

Let (t_i) be a measurable enumeration of the jumps of S and $M_t = e^{-S_t}\prod_{t_i\leq t}(1+2|\Delta S_{t_i}|)e^{-2|\Delta S_{t_i}|}$ for all $t \geq 0$.

Lemma 25. The process M is a martingale with respect to the natural filtration associated to S.

Proof. In the whole proof we will write $f(x) = (1+2x)e^{-2x}$. To prove the lemma, we first note that $f(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \geq 0$ so the product defining M is always well-defined and $\mathbb{E}\big[M_t\big] \leq \mathbb{E}\big[e^{-S_t}\big] < +\infty$ for all t. Let $(\mathscr{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be the natural filtration associated to S. Since S is a Lévy process, it is easy to see that if $s \leq t$ then $\mathbb{E}\big[M_t|\mathscr{F}_s\big] = M_s\mathbb{E}\big[M_{t-s}\big]$. Hence, it is enough to prove that $\mathbb{E}\big[M_t\big] = 1$ for all t.

We claim that for all $u \geq 0$ and $t \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[e^{-uS_t}\prod_{t_i\leq t} f(\Delta S_{t_i})\Big] = e^{t\psi(u)}, \tag{23}$$

where $\psi(u) = \int_0^{+\infty}(e^{-ux}f(x) - 1 + ux)\mu(\mathrm{d}x) = \sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}\frac{u^2+u-2}{\sqrt{u+2}}$. Once this is proved, we have in particular $\psi(1) = 0$ and the lemma follows. To prove (23), for $\varepsilon > 0$ we write

$$S_t^\varepsilon = \sum_{\substack{t_i\leq t\\ \Delta S_{t_i}\geq\varepsilon}} \Delta S_{t_i} - t\int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} x\,\mu(\mathrm{d}x).$$

We know that S_t is the a.s. limit of S_t^ε as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Moreover, for all ε we have

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-2uS_t^\varepsilon}\big] = \exp\Big(t\int_\varepsilon^{+\infty}(e^{-2ux} - 1 + 2ux)\mu(\mathrm{d}x)\Big) \leq \mathbb{E}\big[e^{-2uS_t}\big].$$

Hence, since $f \leq 1$, the variables $e^{-uS_t^\varepsilon}\prod_{\substack{t_i\leq t\\ \Delta S_{t_i}\geq\varepsilon}} f(\Delta S_{t_i})$ are bounded in L^2 as $\varepsilon \to 0$ so they are uniformly integrable and the left-hand-side of (23) is equal to

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mathbb{E}\Big[e^{-uS_t^\varepsilon}\prod_{\substack{t_i\leq t\\ \Delta S_{t_i}\geq\varepsilon}} f(\Delta S_{t_i})\Big] = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} e^{tu\int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} x\mu(\mathrm{d}x)}\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\substack{t_i\leq t\\ \Delta S_{t_i}\geq\varepsilon}} e^{-u\Delta S_{t_i}}f(\Delta S_{t_i})\Big].$$

By the exponential formula for Poisson point processes, the expectation is equal to

$$\exp\Big(t\int_\varepsilon^{+\infty}\big(e^{-ux}f(x) - 1\big)\mu(\mathrm{d}x)\Big),$$

which proves (23) by letting $\varepsilon \to 0$. □

Since M is a martingale with $M_0 = e^{-S_0}$, we may consider the process S biased by $e^{S_0}M$. We write it S^h. From the form of M it is easy to prove that S^h is a Lévy process. Moreover, by (23) it holds for all $u \geq 0$ that

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-uS_t^h}\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[M_t e^{-uS_t}\big] = e^{t\psi(u+1)} = \exp\big(\sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}u\sqrt{u+3}\big). \tag{24}$$

We can also compute the jump measure of S^h, which is given by

$$\mu^h(\mathrm{d}x) = (1+2x)e^{-2x}\mu(dx) = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2\pi}}\frac{1+2x}{x^{5/2}}e^{-2x}\mathbb{1}_{x>0}\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{25}$$

In order to study the continuous-state branching process (CSBP) associated to S^h via the Lamperti transform, we consider the process S^h started from $x > 0$ and write $\tau = \inf\{t|S_t^h = 0\}$. Note that τ is a.s. finite since S^h drifts to $-\infty$ and has only positive jumps. We claim that

$(S^h_{t\wedge\tau})_{t\geq 0}$ under $\mathbb{P}_x$ has density $e^x M_\tau$ with respect to $(S_{t\wedge\tau})_{t\geq 0}$ under $\mathbb{P}_x$. To prove it, we write $\tau_n = \frac{\lceil 2^n\tau\rceil}{2^n}$. For all $t_1,\dots,t_k$ and $f:\mathbb{R}^k\to\mathbb{R}$ bounded we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\big[f(S^h_{t_1\wedge\tau},\dots,S^h_{t_k\wedge\tau})\big] &= \lim_{n\to+\infty}\mathbb{E}\big[f(S^h_{t_1\wedge\tau_n},\dots,S^h_{t_k\wedge\tau_n})\big]\\
&= \lim_{n\to+\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}\big[f(S^h_{t_1\wedge\tau_n},\dots,S^h_{t_k\wedge\tau_n})\mathbb{1}_{\tau_n=i/2^n}\big]\\
&= \lim_{n\to+\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}\big[M_{i/2^n}f(S_{t_1\wedge\tau_n},\dots,S_{t_k\wedge\tau_n})\mathbb{1}_{\tau_n=i/2^n}\big]\\
&= \lim_{n\to+\infty}\mathbb{E}\big[M_{\tau_n}f(S_{t_1\wedge\tau_n},\dots,S_{t_k\wedge\tau_n})\big]\\
&= \mathbb{E}\big[M_{\tau}f(S_{t_1\wedge\tau},\dots,S_{t_k\wedge\tau})\big],
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim.

We now introduce Z^h, the CSBP with branching mechanism $\psi^h(u)=\sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}u\sqrt{u+3}$ that is associated with S^h via the Lamperti transform. We also write Z for the CSBP with branching mechanism $\sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}u^{3/2}$. Since the Lamperti transform is a measurable function of the Lévy process, the branching process Z^h started from x has density $e^x\prod_{t_i}(1+2|\Delta Z_{t_i}|)e^{-2|\Delta Z_{t_i}|}$ with respect to Z started from x.

We will now do the same construction as Curien and Le Gall in Section 2.1 of [17] with this new branching mechanism. The semigroup of Z^h is characterized as follows: for all $\lambda>0$ and $x,t\geq 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_x\big[e^{-\lambda Z^h_t}\big]=e^{-xu^h_t(\lambda)},$$

where

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}u^h_t(\lambda)}{\mathrm{d}t}=-\sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}u^h_t(\lambda)\sqrt{u^h_t(\lambda)+3}\quad\text{ and }\quad u_0(\lambda)=\lambda. \tag{26}$$

The solution of this equation is

$$u^h_t(\lambda)=\frac{3}{\sinh^2\Big(\operatorname{argsh}\sqrt{\frac{3}{\lambda}}+\sqrt{2}t\Big)},$$

which gives

$$\mathbb{E}_x\big[e^{-\lambda Z^h_t}\big]=\exp\Big(-\frac{3x}{\sinh^2\Big(\operatorname{argsh}\sqrt{\frac{3}{\lambda}}+\sqrt{2}t\Big)}\Big)$$

and, by differentiating with respect to λ,

$$\mathbb{E}_x\big[Z^h_t e^{-\lambda Z^h_t}\big]=\frac{3\sqrt{3}x}{\lambda\sqrt{\lambda+3}}\frac{\cosh\Big(\operatorname{argsh}\sqrt{\frac{3}{\lambda}}+\sqrt{2}t\Big)}{\sinh^3\Big(\operatorname{argsh}\sqrt{\frac{3}{\lambda}}+\sqrt{2}t\Big)}\exp\Big(-\frac{3x}{\sinh^2\Big(\operatorname{argsh}\sqrt{\frac{3}{\lambda}}+\sqrt{2}t\Big)}\Big). \tag{27}$$

Let $\tau'=\inf\{t\geq 0|Z^h_t=0\}$ be the extinction time of Z^h. By the above calculation we have

$$\mathbb{P}_x\big(\tau'\leq t\big)=\mathbb{P}\big(Z^h_t=0\big)=\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-\lambda Z^h_t}\big]=\exp\Big(-\frac{3x}{\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)}\Big),$$

and τ' has density

$$\Phi^h_t(x)=6\sqrt{2}x\frac{\cosh(\sqrt{2}t)}{\sinh^3(\sqrt{2}t)}\exp\Big(-\frac{3x}{\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)}\Big) \tag{28}$$

with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

We now introduce the process Z^h conditioned on extinction at a fixed time ρ. If we denote $q_t(x, \mathrm{d}y)$ the transition kernels of Z^h, we define the process Z^h conditioned on extinction at time ρ as the time-inhomogeneous Markov process indexed by $[0, \rho]$ whose transition kernel between times s and t is

$$\pi_{s,t}(x, \mathrm{d}y) = \frac{\Phi^h_{\rho-t}(y)}{\Phi^h_{\rho-s}(x)} q_{t-s}(x, \mathrm{d}y)$$

for $x > 0$ and $0 \leq s < t < \rho$ and

$$\pi_{s,\rho}(x, \mathrm{d}y) = \delta_0(\mathrm{d}y).$$

As in [17], this interpretation can be justified by the fact that for all $0 < s_1 < \cdots < s_k$ the conditional distribution of $(Z^h_{s_1}, \ldots, Z^h_{s_k})$ on $\mathbb{P}_x\big(\,\cdot\,|\rho \leq \tau' \leq \rho + \varepsilon\big)$ converges to

$$\pi_{0,s_1}(x, \mathrm{d}y_1)\pi_{s_1,s_2}(y_1, \mathrm{d}y_2) \cdots \pi_{s_{k-1},s_k}(y_{k-1}, \mathrm{d}y_k)$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$.

We also recall that the extinction time of Z has density $\Phi_t(x) = \frac{3x}{t^3} \exp\Big(-\frac{3x}{2t^2}\Big)$ (see Section 2.1 of [17]). Hence, the process Z^h started from x and conditioned to die at time ρ has density

$$e^x \frac{\Phi_\rho(x)}{\Phi^h_\rho(x)} \prod_{t_i \geq 0} (1 + 2|\Delta Z_{t_i}|) e^{-2|\Delta Z_{t_i}|} \tag{29}$$

with respect to Z started from x and conditioned to die at time ρ (to prove this, we just need to condition on $\rho \leq \tau' \leq \rho + \varepsilon$ and let ε go to 0).

Following [17] it is easy to construct a process $(X^h_t)_{t \leq 0}$ with càdlàg paths and no negative jumps such that:

(i) $X^h_t > 0$ for all $t < 0$ and $X^h_0 = 0$ a.s.

(ii) $X^h_t \longrightarrow +\infty$ almost surely as $t \to -\infty$.

(iii) For all x, if $T_x = \inf\{t \leq 0 | X_t \leq x\}$, the process $(X^h_{(T_x+t)\wedge 0})_{t \geq 0}$ has the same distribution as the process Z^h started from x.

By Proposition 4.4 of [17], the process $(X_{t-\rho})_{0 \leq t \leq \rho}$ conditioned on $X_{-\rho} = x$ has the same distribution as Z started from x and conditioned to die exactly at time ρ. By the same proof as in [17], this also holds for X^h and Z^h. Hence, $(X^h_{-t})_{0 \leq t \leq \rho}$ conditioned on $X^h_{-\rho} = x$ has the density (29) with respect to $(X_{-t})_{0 \leq t \leq \rho}$ conditioned on $X_{-\rho} = x$, which has the same distribution as $(P_r)_{0 \leq r \leq \rho}$ conditioned on $P_\rho = x$. But by (22), the process $(P^h_r)_{0 \leq r \leq \rho}$ conditioned on $P^h_\rho = x$ has a density of the form

$$f(x, \rho) \prod_{t_i} (1 + 2|\Delta Z_{t_i}|) e^{-2|\Delta Z_{t_i}|}$$

with respect to $(P_r)_{0 \leq r \leq \rho}$ conditioned on $P_\rho = x$. Since the density must have expectation one, we must have $f(x, \rho) = e^x \frac{\Phi_\rho(x)}{\Phi^h_\rho(x)}$.

Hence, in order to prove that P^h has the same distribution as $(X^h_{-t})_{t \geq 0}$, we only need to prove that these two processes have the same one-dimensional marginals. To this end, we will now compute the Laplace transform of the one-dimensional marginals of X^h.

Lemma 26. For all $t \geq 0$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-\lambda X^h_{-t}}\big] = \Big(1 + \frac{\lambda}{3}\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)\Big)^{-1}\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda}{3}\tanh^2(\sqrt{2}t)\Big)^{-1/2}$$

Proof. By the exact same proof as in the beginning of the proof of Proposition 1.2 (ii) in [17] we have

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-\lambda X^h_{-t}}\big] = \lim_{x\to+\infty} \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda Z^h_s}\Phi^h_t(Z^h_s)\mathrm{d}s\Big] = \lim_{x\to+\infty}\int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{E}_x\big[e^{-\lambda Z^h_s}\Phi^h_t(Z^h_s)\big]\mathrm{d}s.$$

By (28) and (27), one can express $\mathbb{E}_x\big[e^{-\lambda Z^h_s}\Phi^h_t(Z^h_s)\big]$ exactly:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_x\big[e^{-\lambda Z^h_s}\Phi^h_t(Z^h_s)\big] &= 6\sqrt{2}\frac{\cosh(\sqrt{2}t)}{\sinh^3(\sqrt{2}t)}\mathbb{E}_x\Big[Z^h_s \exp\Big(-\Big(\lambda + \frac{3}{\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)}\Big)Z^h_s\Big)\Big] \\
&= \frac{18\sqrt{6}x}{\Big(\lambda + \frac{3}{\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)}\Big)\sqrt{\lambda + 3\coth^2(\sqrt{2}t)}}\frac{\cosh(\sqrt{2}t)}{\sinh^3(\sqrt{2}t)} \\
&\times \frac{\cosh\Big(\mathrm{argsh}\sqrt{\frac{3\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)}{\lambda\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)+3}} + \sqrt{2}s\Big)}{\sinh^3\Big(\mathrm{argsh}\sqrt{\frac{3\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)}{\lambda\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)+3}} + \sqrt{2}s\Big)} \\
&\times \exp\left(-\frac{3x}{\sinh^2\Big(\mathrm{argsh}\sqrt{\frac{3\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)}{\lambda\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)+3}} + \sqrt{2}s\Big)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We can now integrate over $s \geq 0$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{E}_x\big[e^{-\lambda Z^h_s}\Phi^h_t(Z^h_s)\big]\mathrm{d}s &= \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{\Big(\lambda + \frac{3}{\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)}\Big)\sqrt{\lambda + 3\coth^2(\sqrt{2}t)}}\frac{\cosh(\sqrt{2}t)}{\sinh^3(\sqrt{2}t)} \\
&\times \left(1 - \exp\Big(-x\Big(\lambda + \frac{3}{\sinh^2(\sqrt{2}t)}\Big)\Big)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

As $x \to +\infty$ the last factor goes to 1 and we get the claimed result. □

The verification that P^h_t has indeed the same Laplace transform is obtained by combining Lemma 24 and the Laplace transform of the variables P_r and V_r that are computed in Proposition 1.2 and 1.4 of [17]. The computation is essentially the same as the proof of Lemma 17 and we omit it there. □

3.4 Asymptotics for the perimeter and volume processes

Proof of Corollary 1. Exactly as in Section 4.4 of [18] for the critical case, we can give another construction of the process (P^h_r, V^h_r) via the Lamperti transform. Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be the Lévy process started from 0 with no positive jumps whose distribution is characterized by:

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{u\mathcal{Z}_t}\big] = \exp\Big(t\sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}u\sqrt{u+3}\Big) \text{ for } u \geq 0.$$

Note that this process exists: $\mathcal{Z}$ is the time-reversal of the Lévy process S^h described in Section 3.1 (hence the notation $\mathcal{Z}$, which is the mirror of S). If we apply the inverse Lamperti transform to P^h, we obtain the Lévy process S^h seen before the first time it hits 0, and then time-reversed. But by Theorem VII.18 of [12], this has the same distribution as $\mathcal{Z}$, conditioned to remain positive for all $t \geq 0$.

So let $\mathcal{Z}^+$ be the process $\mathcal{Z}$, conditioned to remain positive. Let (s_i) be a measurable enumeration of the jumps of $\mathcal{Z}$ and, conditionally on $\mathcal{Z}$, let $\left(\xi_i^h\right)$ be independent variables such that for all i, the variable ξ_i^h has distribution $\nu_{|\Delta\mathcal{Z}_{s_i}|}$. We write

$$L_t = \sum_{s_i} \xi_i^h.$$

Let also L_t^+ be the process obtained by performing the exact same operation on $\mathcal{Z}^+$. We also write

$$\eta_t = \inf\left\{ s \geq 0 \Big| \int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\mathcal{Z}_u^+} \geq t \right\}.$$

Then, by the same arguments as in [18], we have

$$\left(P_r^h, V_r^h\right)_{r\geq 0} \overset{(d)}{=} \left(\mathcal{Z}_{\eta_t}^+, L_{\eta_t}^+\right)_{t\geq 0}.$$

It is now easy to obtain an asymptotic estimation of (P_r^h) through the study of $\mathcal{Z}$ and its conditioned version $\mathcal{Z}^+$: for all t we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{Z}_t\right] &= \frac{d}{du}\Big|_{u=0} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{u\mathcal{Z}_t^+}\right] \\
&= \frac{d}{du}\Big|_{u=0} \exp\left(t\sqrt{\frac{8}{3}u\sqrt{u+3}}\right) \\
&= 2\sqrt{2}t.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it holds that $\mathbb{E}\left[e^{u\mathcal{Z}_t}\right] < +\infty$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $u \geq -3$ (it follows easily from the definition of S^h as S biased by an explicit martingale and the fact that $\mathcal{Z}$ is its time-reversal). Hence, by a classic moderate deviation argument we have almost surely $\frac{\mathcal{Z}_n}{n} = 2\sqrt{2} + O(n^{-1/4})$ as $n \to +\infty$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, let $c > 0$ be such that $\mathbb{P}\big(|\mathcal{Z}_t| \leq c\big) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$. By the strong Markov property we have $\mathbb{P}\big(|\mathcal{Z}_1| \geq x - c\big) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}\big(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\mathcal{Z}_t| \geq x\big)$ for all $x > 0$, so the random variable $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\mathcal{Z}_t|$ has exponential tails on both sides, so for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough and $0 \leq t \leq 1$ we have $|\mathcal{Z}_{n+t} - \mathcal{Z}_n| \leq n^{1/4}$. Hence, we have $\frac{\mathcal{Z}_t}{t} \underset{t\to+\infty}{\overset{a.s.}{=}} 2\sqrt{2} + O(t^{-1/4})$.

But the distribution of $(\mathcal{Z}_{t+1}^+ - \mathcal{Z}_1^+)$ is just that of $\mathcal{Z}$, conditioned on an event of positive probability ($\mathcal{Z}$ drifts to $+\infty$ so it has a positive probability never to hit 0 after time 1), so we deduce from above that

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}_t^+}{t} \underset{t\to+\infty}{\overset{a.s.}{=}} 2\sqrt{2} + O(t^{-1/4}) \text{ , and so } \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_t^+} \underset{t\to+\infty}{\overset{a.s.}{=}} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\,t} + O(t^{-5/4}).$$

The integral of the error term converges so there is a random variable X_∞ such that $\int_0^s \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\mathcal{Z}_u^+} = \frac{\ln s}{2\sqrt{2}} + X_\infty + o(1)$ a.s. Hence $\frac{\ln \eta_t}{2\sqrt{2}} = t - X_\infty + o(1)$ and $\eta_t \sim e^{-2\sqrt{2}X_\infty} e^{2\sqrt{2}t}$ a.s. We finally get

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\eta_t}^+ \sim 2\sqrt{2}\eta_t \sim 2\sqrt{2}e^{-2\sqrt{2}X_\infty} e^{2\sqrt{2}t}$$

a.s., so there is a random variable $0 < \mathcal{E} < +\infty$ such that $e^{-2\sqrt{2}r} P_r^h \xrightarrow[r\to+\infty]{a.s.} \mathcal{E}$.

To prove that $\frac{V_r^h}{P_r^h}$ converges a.s. to a deterministic constant we first notice that L is a nondecreasing Lévy process. By construction we have

$$\mathbb{E}\big[L_1\big] = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{E}\big[\xi^h(x)\big]\mu^h(dx)$$

where μ^h is the jump measure of S^h that is computed in (25), and $\xi^h(x)$ has distribution ν_x. One can compute $\mathbb{E}\big[\xi^h(x)\big] = \frac{x^2}{2x+1}$. Since μ^h integrates x^2 near 0 and has exponential tail the last display is finite and so by the law of large numbers

$$\frac{L_t}{t} \xrightarrow[t\to+\infty]{a.s.} c$$

where $c = \mathbb{E}\big[L_1\big]$, and the same holds for L^+ by absolute continuity on $[1, +\infty[$.

In order to complete the proof of Corollary 1 we only need to find the distribution of $\mathcal{E}$ and the constant c. We will do this with Laplace transforms. We know that for all $\lambda, \mu \geq 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-\lambda\mathcal{E}-c\mu\mathcal{E}}\big] = \lim_{r\to+\infty} \mathbb{E}\Big[\exp\big(-\lambda e^{-2\sqrt{2}r} P_r^h - e^{-2\sqrt{2}r} V_r^h\big)\Big].$$

But we can compute these Laplace transforms thanks to Lemma 24 and Proposition 1.2 and 1.4 of [17]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-\lambda P_r^h - \mu V_r^h}\big] &= \mathbb{E}\big[e^{-\lambda P_r} e^{-\mu V_r} e^{P_r} e^{-2V_r} \int_0^1 e^{-3x^2 P_r} \mathrm{d}x\big] \\
&= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\Big[e^{(1-\lambda-3x^2)P_r} \mathbb{E}\big[e^{-(\mu+2)V_r} | P_r\big]\Big] \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \Big(1 + \frac{2\lambda - 2 + \sqrt{2\mu+4}}{3\sqrt{2\mu+4}} \sinh^2\big((2\mu+4)^{1/4} r\big)\Big)^{-1} \\
&\quad \times \Big(1 + \frac{2\lambda + 4 - 2\sqrt{2\mu+4}}{3\sqrt{2\mu+4}} \tanh^2\big((2\mu+4)^{1/4} r\big)\Big)^{-1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives the value of $\mathbb{E}\Big[\exp\Big(-e^{-2\sqrt{2}r}\lambda P_r^h - e^{-2\sqrt{2}r}\mu V_r^h\Big)\Big]$. When we let r go to $+\infty$, the second factor goes to 1. We also have

$$\frac{2\lambda e^{-2\sqrt{2}r} - 2 + \sqrt{2\mu e^{-2\sqrt{2}r} + 4}}{3\sqrt{2\mu e^{-2\sqrt{2}r} + 4}} \sim \frac{\big(2\lambda + \mu/2\big) e^{-2\sqrt{2}r}}{6}$$

and $\sinh^2\big((2\mu e^{-2\sqrt{2}r} + 4)^{1/4} r\big) \sim \Big(\frac{e^{\sqrt{2}r}}{2}\Big)^2$ so the first factor goes to $\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda}{12} + \frac{\mu}{48}\Big)^{-1}$. This is the Laplace transform of the couple $\Big(X, \frac{1}{4}X\Big)$ where X is an exponential variable of parameter 12. This ends the proof. □

A Proof of Proposition 10

The goal of this appendix is to prove Proposition 10. We note that similar ideas to those below appear in Section 2 of [31], and more precisely in the proofs of Proposition 2.17 and 2.18. In

particular, Lemma 30 is essentially proved in the proof of Proposition 2.18 there. As earlier, if A is a subset of a metric space X and $\varepsilon > 0$ we will write A^ε for the union of all the open balls of radius ε centered at an element of A. Note that this is an open subset of X. We also recall that $B_r(X)$ and $\overline{B_r}(X)$ are respectively the closed ball and the hull centered at the root of X. In particular, they are both closed subsets of X. To prove Proposition 10 we will also use several times the following definition.

Definition 27. Let (X, d) be a metric space, $x, y \in X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. An *ε-chain from x to y* is a finite sequence of points $(z_i)_{0 \leq i \leq k}$ of X such that $z_0 = x$, $z_k = y$ and satisfying $d(z_i, z_{i+1}) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k-1$.

Lemma 28. Under the assumptions of Proposition 10, the application $s \to \overline{B_s}(X)$ is continuous at r for the Hausdorff distance on the set of the compact subsets of $\overline{B_{r+1}}(X)$.

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$: it is enough to show that for some ε we have:

a) $\overline{B_{r+\varepsilon}}(X) \subset \overline{B_r}(X)^\delta$

b) $\overline{B_r}(X) \subset \overline{B_{r-\varepsilon}}(X)^\delta$.

We start with the first point. Let $A = \Big(\bigcap_{\varepsilon>0} \overline{B_{r+\varepsilon}}(X)\Big) \backslash \overline{B_r}(X)$: if $x \in A$ then there is a geodesic from x to a point $y \in X \backslash \overline{B_{r+1}}(X)$ that stays outside $B_r(X)$ but it has to intersect $B_{r+\varepsilon}(X)$ for all X. This is clearly impossible, so $A = \emptyset$. In particular, the decreasing intersection of the compact sets $\overline{B_{r+1/n}}(X) \backslash \overline{B_r}(X)^\delta$ is empty, so one of these compact sets is empty, which proves the first point.

For the second point, let $A' = \big(\overline{B_r}(X) \backslash B_r(X)\big) \backslash \Big(\bigcup_{\varepsilon>0} \overline{B_{r-\varepsilon}}(X)\Big)$: by assumption (iii) we have $\mu(A') = \emptyset$ and A' is open, so by assumption (ii) we get $A' = \emptyset$. This implies $\overline{B_r}(X) \backslash B_r(X) \subset \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \overline{B_{r-1/n}}(X)^\delta$. Moreover, we have $B_r(X) \subset \overline{B_{r-1/n}}(X)^\delta$ for $\frac{1}{n} < \delta$. Hence, the increasing family of open sets $\overline{B_{r-1/n}}(X)^\delta$ covers the compact space $\overline{B_r}(X)$, so there is an ε such that $\overline{B_r}(X) \subset \overline{B_{r-\varepsilon}}(X)^\delta$. □

Remark 29. Note that the first point is true even without assumptions (ii) and (iii).

Lemma 30. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let (X, ρ, a) and (Y, ρ, b) be two bipointed subsets of a locally compact metric space Z. Assume that X and Y are compact, connected spaces, and that the Hausdorff distance between X and Y is less than ε. Then for all r such that $r + 4\varepsilon < d(\rho, b)$:

1) $\overline{B_r}(X)^\varepsilon \cap Y \subset \overline{B_{r+4\varepsilon}}(Y)$

2) $\overline{B_r}(X) \subset \overline{B_{r+4\varepsilon}}(Y)^\varepsilon$.

Proof. We first notice that the connectedness of X implies that for any two points x and x' in X, there is an ε-chain in X from x to x'. The same is true for Y.

Let y be a point in $\overline{B_r}(X)^\varepsilon \cap Y$. We can assume $d(\rho, y) > r + 4\varepsilon$ (if it is not the case the result is obvious). Let $(z_i)_{0 \leq i \leq k}$ be an ε-chain from y to b in Y. We know that $d(a, b) \leq \varepsilon$ and that there is a point $x \in X$ such that $d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon$. We write $w_0 = x$, $w_k = a$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ we take $w_i \in X$ such that $d(w_i, z_i) \leq \varepsilon$ (see Figure 1 for an illustration). For all i we have $d(w_i, w_{i+1}) \leq d(w_i, z_i) + d(z_i, z_{i+1}) + d(z_{i+1}, w_{i+1}) \leq 3\varepsilon$ so (w_i) is a 3ε-chain from x to a in X. Since $x \in \overline{B_r}(X)$ there must be at least one i such that $d(\rho, w_i) \leq r + 3\varepsilon$, which



Figure 1: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 30

implies $d(\rho, z_i) \leq r + 4\varepsilon$. Every ε-chain from y to b has at least one point at distance from the root less than $r + 4\varepsilon$, so there is no ε-chain from y to b in $Y \backslash B_{r+4\varepsilon}(Y)$, so y and b do not lie in the same connected component of $Y \backslash B_{r+4\varepsilon}(Y)$ and $y \in \overline{B_{r+4\varepsilon}}(Y)$, which proves the first point of the lemma.

The second point is easily obtained from the first one: if $x \in \overline{B_r}(X)$, then there is a $y \in Y$ such that $d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon$. By the first point we have $y \in \overline{B_{r+4\varepsilon}}(Y)$ so $x \in \overline{B_{r+4\varepsilon}}(Y)^\varepsilon$. □

Proof of Proposition 10. First we need to prove that the radii of the $\overline{B_r}(X_n)$ are bounded: let $R = \max\{d(\rho, x) | x \in \overline{B_{r+4}}(X)\}$ be the radius of $\overline{B_{r+4}}(X)$: for n large enough we have

$$d_{GH}(B_{R+3}(X_n), B_{R+3}(X)) < 1.$$

We write $X' = B_{R+3}(X)$ and $X'_n = B_{R+3}(X_n)$: the above inequality means we can embed $B_{R+3}(X_n)$ and $B_{R+3}(X)$ isometrically in the same space (Z, d) in such a way that $X'_n \subset (X')^1$ and $\rho_n = \rho$.

Let $b \in X'_n \backslash B_{R+2}(X_n)$ and $a \in X'$ such that $d(a, b) \leq 1$: we have $d(a, \rho) \geq R + 1$, so $a \notin \overline{B_r}(X)$ and $\overline{B_r}(X) = \overline{B_r}(X')$ is the hull of radius r with center ρ with respect to a in X'. By the second point of lemma 30 for $\varepsilon = 1$ we have $\overline{B_r}(X'_n) \subset \overline{B_{r+4}}(X')^1$, which means the radius of $\overline{B_r}(X'_n)$ is less than $R + 1$. This means that only one connected component of $X' \backslash B_r(X'_n)$ contains points at distance greater than $R + 1$ from the root. In other words, the radius of $\overline{B_r}(X_n)$ is at most $R + 1$.

We now move on to the proof of our proposition: let $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that 4ε satisfies the conclusion of lemma 28. Since we have a Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov convergence, we can embed X'_n and X' in the same space Z in such a way that:

a) $\rho = \rho_n$

b) $(X'_n)^\varepsilon \subset X'$

c) $(X')^\varepsilon \subset X_n$

d) For all $A \subset X'_n$ that is measurable we have $\mu_n(A) \leq \mu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$.

e) For all $B \subset X'$ that is measurable we have $\mu(B) \leq \mu_n(B^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$.

This embedding provides a natural way to embed the measured metric spaces $\overline{B_r}(X_n)$ and $\overline{B_r}(X)$ in Z. We will deduce an upper bound for the Gromov–Hausdorff–Prokhorov distance between these two hulls.

For all $y \in \overline{B_r}(X_n)$ there is an $x \in X'$ such that $d(x,y) \leq \varepsilon$. By lemma 30 we have $x \in \overline{B_{r+4\varepsilon}}(X)$, so by lemma 28 we have $x \in \overline{B_r}(X)^\delta$, which proves $\overline{B_r}(X_n) \subset \overline{B_r}(X)^{\delta+\varepsilon}$.

Similarly for all $x \in \overline{B_r}(X)$ we have $x \in \overline{B_{r-4\varepsilon}}(X)^\delta$ by lemma 28. Let $z \in \overline{B_{r-4\varepsilon}}(X)$ be such that $d(x,z) \leq \delta$. There is a $y \in X'_n$ such that $d(y,z) \leq \varepsilon$. By lemma 30 we have $y \in \overline{B_{r-4\varepsilon+4\varepsilon}}(X_n)$ and $d(x,y) \leq \delta + \varepsilon$, which proves $\overline{B_r}(X) \subset \overline{B_r}(X_n)^{\delta+\varepsilon}$. Hence, in this embedding the Hausdorff distance between $\overline{B_r}(X)$ and $\overline{B_r}(X_n)$ is less than $\varepsilon + \delta$.

For all $A \subset \overline{B_r}(X_n)$ measurable we have $\mu_n(A) \leq \mu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon = \mu\big(A^\varepsilon \cap X'\big) + \varepsilon$. By lemma 30 we have the inclusion $A^\varepsilon \cap X' \subset A^\varepsilon \cap \overline{B_{r+4\varepsilon}}(X)$, so we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_n(A) &\leq \varepsilon + \mu\big(A^\varepsilon \cap \overline{B_{r+4\varepsilon}}(X)\big)\\ &\leq \varepsilon + \mu\big(A^\varepsilon \cap \overline{B_r}(X)\big) + V(r+4\varepsilon) - V(r),\end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $V(s) = \mu(\overline{B_s}(X))$ for all s.

Similarly, for all $B \subset \overline{B_r}(X)$ measurable we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(B) &\leq \mu\big(B \cap \overline{B_{r-4\varepsilon}}(X)\big) + V(r) - V(r-4\varepsilon)\\ &\leq \varepsilon + \mu_n\big((B \cap \overline{B_{r-4\varepsilon}}(X))^\varepsilon \cap X'_n\big) + V(r) - V(r-4\varepsilon)\\ &\leq \varepsilon + \mu_n\big(B^\varepsilon \cap \overline{B_{r-4\varepsilon}}(X)^\varepsilon \cap X'_n\big) + V(r) - V(r-4\varepsilon)\\ &\leq \varepsilon + \mu_n\big(B^\varepsilon \cap \overline{B_r}(X_n)\big) + V(r) - V(r-4\varepsilon),\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses lemma 30.

Hence, this embedding of $\overline{B_r}(X)$ and $\overline{B_r(X_n)}$ gives the following bound for n large enough:

$$d_{GHP}\big(\overline{B_r}(X), \overline{B_r}(X_n)\big) \leq \max\Big(\varepsilon + \delta, \varepsilon + V(r+4\varepsilon) - V(r), \varepsilon + V(r) - V(r-4\varepsilon)\Big).$$

By assumption (*iii*) in the statement of the proposition the right-hand side can be made arbitrarily small, which proves the first point of Proposition 10. The second point is an obvious consequence of the first one. □

Remark 31. Proposition 10 remains true if we replace X and X_n by compact bipointed spaces converging for the GHP distance, as long as r is smaller than the distance between the two distinguished points (if it is not, the result is obvious). The first part of the proof (i.e. proving that the sequence $\big(\overline{B_r}(X_n)\big)$ is bounded) is not necessary anymore and we may apply the second part of the proof directly to X and X_n instead of their balls of radius $R+3$.

References

[1] C. Abraham. Rescaled bipartite planar maps converge to the Brownian map. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. (to appear), arXiv:1312.5959.*

[2] R. Abraham, J.-F. Delmas, and P. Hoscheit. A note on the gromov-hausdorff-prokhorov distance between (locally) compact metric measure spaces. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 18:no. 14, 1–21, 2013.

[3] L. Addario-Berry and M. Albenque. The scaling limit of random simple triangulations and random simple quadrangulations. *arXiv:1306.5227*.

[4] L. Addario-Berry, N. Broutin, and C. Goldschmidt. The continuum limit of critical random graphs. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 152(3-4):367–406, 2012.

[5] L. Addario-Berry, N. Broutin, C. Goldschmidt, and G. Miermont. The scaling limit of the minimum spanning tree of the complete graph. *arxiv:1301.1664*, 2013.

[6] D. Aldous and R. Lyons. Processes on unimodular random networks. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 12:no. 54, 1454–1508 (electronic), 2007.

[7] O. Angel. Growth and percolation on the uniform infinite planar triangulation. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 13(5):935–974, 2003.

[8] O. Angel and G. Ray. Classification of half-planar maps. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(3):1315–1349, 2015.

[9] O. Angel and O. Schramm. Uniform infinite planar triangulation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 241(2-3):191–213, 2003.

[10] J. Beltran and J.-F. Le Gall. Quadrangulations with no pending vertices. *Bernoulli*, 19:1150–1175, 2013.

[11] I. Benjamini and N. Curien. Ergodic theory on stationary random graphs. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 17(93):1–20, 2012.

[12] J. Bertoin. *Lévy processes*, volume 121 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

[13] J. Bettinelli, E. Jacob, and G. Miermont. The scaling limit of uniform random plane maps, via the Ambjørn-Budd bijection. *Electronic J. Probab.*, 19, 2014.

[14] T. Budd and N. Curien. Growth in infinite planar maps with high degrees. *arxiv:1602.01328*, 2016.

[15] D. Burago, Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov. *A course in metric geometry*, volume 33 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[16] N. Curien. Planar stochastic hyperbolic triangulations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields (to appear)*.

[17] N. Curien and J.-F. Le Gall. The hull process of the Brownian plane. *Probab. Theory Related Fields (to appear)*.

[18] N. Curien and J.-F. Le Gall. Scaling limits for the peeling process on random maps. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. (to appear)*.

[19] N. Curien and J.-F. Le Gall. The Brownian plane. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 27(4):1249–1291, 2014.

[20] N. Curien and J.-F. Le Gall. First-passage percolation and local perturbations on random planar maps. *arXiv:1511.04264*, 2015.

[21] F. den Hollander. Probability theory: The coupling method. *http://websites.math.leidenuniv.nl/probability/lecturenotes/CouplingLectures.pdf*.

[22] H. Duminil-Copin, C. Garban, and G. Pete. The near-critical planar FK-Ising model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 326(1):1–35, 2014.

[23] C. Garban, G. Pete, and O. Schramm. The scaling limits of near-critical and dynamical percolation. *arXiv:1305.5526*, 2013.

[24] H. Kesten. Scaling relations for 2D-percolation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 109(1):109–156, 1987.

[25] M. Krikun. Explicit enumeration of triangulations with multiple boundaries. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 14(1):Research Paper 61, 14 pp. (electronic), 2007.

[26] J.-F. Le Gall. Random geometry on the sphere. *Proceedings of the ICM 2014*.

[27] J.-F. Le Gall. Uniqueness and universality of the Brownian map. *Ann. Probab.*, 41:2880–2960, 2013.

[28] J.-F. Le Gall. The Brownian cactus II: upcrossings and local times of super-Brownian motion. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 162(1):199–231, 2014.

[29] G. Miermont. Aspects of random maps. *preprint, http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/gregory.miermont/coursSaint-Flour.pdf*.

[30] G. Miermont. The Brownian map is the scaling limit of uniform random plane quadrangulations. *Acta Math.*, 210(2):319–401, 2013.

[31] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. An axiomatic characterization of the Brownian map. *arXiv:1506.03806*, 2015.

[32] P. Nolin and W. Werner. Asymmetry of near-critical percolation interfaces. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 22(3):797–819, 2009.

[33] R. Stephenson. Local convergence of large critical multi-type Galton–Watson trees and applications to random maps. *arXiv:1412.6911*.

[34] Y. Wen. The Brownian plane with minimal neck baby universe. *arXiv:1511.01028*, Nov. 2015.